DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 899 IR 009 814

AUTHOR Daval, Nicola, Ed.
TITLE Resources for Research Libraries. Minutes of the Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (98th, New York, New York, May 7-8, 1981).
INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 81
NOTE 144p.; For related documents, see ED 195 258 and ED 202 483.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC ($7.50 per issue for members, $12.50 for non-members).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; College Administration; *Educational Change; *Federal Aid; Higher Education; *Library Administration; Library Associations; Library Planning; *Research Libraries; Resource Allocation; *Self Evaluation (Groups)
IDENTIFIERS Higher Education Act Title II

ABSTRACT

The management of research libraries and national resources for the funding of research library activities were the major topics addressed by the speakers and discussion sessions at this meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Included are transcripts of the addresses and discussions on higher education's turbulent environment, planning for change in academic organizations, the contribution of libraries to change in higher education, and the capabilities, funding, and agenda of the Office of Management Studies (OMS) for the 80s. Also included are a talk on the impact of the Higher Education Act Title II-C program on research libraries, along with remarks from a reactor panel and further discussion, as well as a talk outlining nine recommendations for North American Research Libraries followed by remarks from a reactor panel and additional discussion. The minutes of the business meeting include reports from the interim executive director, the executive director, and the president of ARL, a report from OMS, and eight other reports from various ARL task forces, programs, and committees. Accompanying the minutes are seven appendices, among which are a summary of recommendations from the AAU Research Universities Project, a summary of the OMS annual report, and the auditor's report. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208399

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Resources for Research Libraries

Minutes of the Ninety-Eighth Meeting

May 7-8, 1981
New York, New York

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Mandel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR009814

1981
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.

Minutes of the meetings of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually by the Association, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Price: ARL Members, $15.00 per year, $7.50 an issue
Nonmembers, $25.00 per year, $12.50 an issue

Editor: Nicola Daval
Association of Research Libraries

Association of Research Libraries
Minutes of the meeting. 1st-
Dec. 1932-
[Princeton, N.J., etc.]
v. 28 cm.
Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th-10th, 12th called respectively: 10th-11th, 13th.
INDEXES:
Subject index.

1st-42d, Dec. 1932-Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 59-30046

Library of Congress [ ]

Printed in U.S.A. ISSN 0044-9652

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.

CONTENTS

	Page
Opening	1
RESOURCES FOR MANAGING RESEARCH LIBRARIES	
HIGHER EDUCATION'S TURBULENT ENVIRONMENT	
Neil L. Rudenstine	2
Discussion	9
PLANNED CHANGE IN ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONS	
Herbert R. Kells	12
THE ROLE AND CONTRIBUTION OF LIBRARIANS TO CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION	
Paul Pohlman	19
PANEL DISCUSSION: OMS CAPABILITIES, FUNDING, AND PROGRAM AGENDA FOR THE '80s	22
Remarks by Page Ackerman	22
Remarks by Irene Hoadley	25
Remarks by Louis Martin	27
Discussion	28
NATIONAL RESOURCES FOR RESEARCH LIBRARIES	
THE IMPACT OF THE HEA TITLE II-C PROGRAM: THREE YEARS EXPERIENCE AND FUTURE PLANS	
Dick W. Hays	32
REACTOR PANEL AND DISCUSSION	37
Remarks by Patricia Battin	37
Remarks by Kenneth Peterson	39
Remarks by Arnold Goren	41
Discussion	44
NINE RECOMMENDATIONS: A PROGRAM FOR NORTH AMERICAN RESEARCH LIBRARIES	
Barbara Turlington	49
REACTOR PANEL AND DISCUSSION	55
Remarks by Margaret Child	55
Remarks by Ann H. Greenberg	57
Remarks by David G. Esplin	58
Discussion	61

Page

BUSINESS MEETING

Report of the Interim Executive Director 63
Report of the Executive Director 65
Report of the Office of Management Studies (with comments by Pamela Darling) 67
Report on the CLR Bibliographic Services Development Program 69
Report on the CLR Professional Education and Training for Research Librarianship Program 71
Report of the ARL Task Force on Library Education 73
Report of the ARL Committee on Interlibrary Loan 75
Admission of New Members 76
Report of the ARL Federal Relations Committee (with comments by Margaret Child) 77
Report on the Production Guidelines for Book Longevity Committee 82
Report of the ARL/CRL Committee on Expanded Access to Journal Collections 84
Report of the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control 84
Report of the ARL President 85

APPENDICES

A. Summary of Recommendations from the AAU Research Universities Project 92

B. OMS Advisory Committee Position Paper 94

C. Summary of Office of Management Studies 1980 Annual Report 97

D. Attendance at the 98th Membership Meeting 105
Member Institutions 105
Name Index for Members 109
Guest and Staff 112

E. Offices, Board of Directors, Committees and Task Forces of the Association 113

F. Membership of the Association of Research Libraries 118

G. Auditor's Report 125

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 98th Meeting

Jay K. Lucker, Presiding

The Ninety-eighth Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries convened at the Biltmore Hotel, New York City, on May 7-8, 1981.

President Jay K. Lucker opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing both the new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and the guests of the Association.

Mr. Lucker introduced James Wyatt, Program Chairman for the meeting, and then turned the program over to Duane E. Webster, who introduced the morning's program and speakers.

HIGHER EDUCATION'S TURBULENT ENVIRONMENT

Neil L. Rudenstine
Princeton University

MR. WEBSTER (Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries): The theme for this morning's session, "Resources for Managing Research Libraries," was suggested by the Office of Management Studies Advisory Committee. The program is designed to reflect on the management of research libraries within a complex, randomly-changing, and often unsympathetic environment; to explore some of the circumstances facing research library administrators; and to take stock of the various forces that will shape the decisions that these executives will make in the future. Within this context, the evolving role of the Office of Management Studies as a resource for ARL directors will be highlighted.

We will begin this morning by reviewing some of the developments in higher education that have implications for library managers. We will then look at some of the concepts, approaches, incentives, and outcomes related to planned change, particularly in regard to the executive leadership role and the involvement of staff in academic organizations; our third speaker will examine the managerial changes for creating and maintaining productive work environments for librarians in higher education. There will be an opportunity for questions from the floor after each of these first three presentations. Following the short coffee break, a panel of Office of Management Studies Advisory Committee members will review the development of the OMS, its financial situation, and plans for future program emphasis. We hope the panel's remarks will lead to a "town meeting" forum, and we encourage you to make observations and contribute suggestions regarding future directions the Association should be taking in library management.

The first speaker this morning is Dr. Neil Rudenstine, Provost of Princeton University. Dr. Rudenstine did his undergraduate work at Princeton, and earned his Ph.D. in history at Harvard. His career at Princeton has included positions as Dean of Students, Dean of the College, and now, Provost. Donald Koepp, the Princeton University Librarian, has described him as better informed about library problems than any other administrator with whom he has worked. In my own contacts with Dr. Rudenstine over the last several years, I have seen his sensitivity to the concerns of research libraries. He displays a keen intellect, a broad awareness of the turbulent environment of higher education, and a determination to grapple with the problems confronting academic administrators. I am pleased to welcome to this meeting Dr. Neil Rudenstine.

MR. RUDENSTINE: Thank you. I appreciate what Don Koepp and Duane have said. It is a great pleasure for me to be here this morning. The topics to be addressed in these meetings are extremely important ones, and I feel privileged to be able to participate.

Let me say candidly, in beginning, that I have very little real expertise to offer about management or libraries. If I am at all useful to you, it may be mainly as an example of the kind of person you have to contend with continuously: another

doubtful specimen from the world of academic administration — someone who is part of the problem, as they used to say in the '60s, rather than part of the solution. I do believe strongly in good management, and I have an intense interest in libraries. But I unfortunately have had no actual training in these fields. My only specialized training in life has been in the field of Renaissance lyric poetry — where I wandered cheerfully for many years among sonnets, elegies, and epithalamia. With that as my background, you can imagine what an endless fund of information and insight I am likely to be able to draw upon as I confront the managerial muddles of daily existence.

The only fragments from my remote academic past which I find increasingly relevant to my present position are those late sixteenth and seventeenth century heroic epics: long labyrinthine, endless tales with an incalculable number of characters and impenetrable plots; where the hero — with whom I identify — wanders from one dark wood to another, from error to error, and blunder to blunder; until thoroughly lost, and totally thwarted by a conspiracy of magicians, tempters, giants, and elves, he gives himself over to the dream of retirement to a sweet pastoral world where "preservation" is not a problem; where "circulation" means the ability to get around in a charming sort of way; where "acquisitions" have to do with members of the opposite sex; and where none of the rules for anything ever change, because there is no Library of Congress.

Since this pastoral dream is, alas, only an illusion, let me turn to the realities of our institutions. With respect to the universities, for example, how can we characterize the situation they are likely to be confronting in the 1980's? What are some of the initiatives they are likely to undertake in response to this situation? In my remarks, I will be concentrating mainly on developments that will be affecting universities in their entirety, in the hope that you will trace most of the more specific implications for libraries and librarians. I see a complicated picture, and it looks something like the following:

First, — and this will come as no surprise — I certainly do not expect substantial positive changes in the economy of universities. If anything, the financial situation has a slightly greater chance of being worse, rather than better, in the immediate future. As we know, universities are inherently labor-intensive. Though parts of universities may be able to automate and increase their productivity, and therefore help to catch up with inflationary tendencies, universities really fall into the category of handicraft industries. The basic, central teaching and research functions are really more like the central functions of a symphony orchestra than they are like an industrial corporation. You cannot play a symphony twice as fast to increase productivity — it does something to the quality. So, too, there are only so many students you can pack into a classroom. One researcher, or even a group of researchers, can only produce first-class research at a certain rate of speed; if you try to hurry it up, you begin to lose the very business you are supposed to be about, from a "quality" point of view. These are really handicraft industries, lagging, by definition, behind the rest of the economy. For this reason, the cost of education has a tendency to rise faster than the cost of most goods and services, even when the economy is doing well. In difficult times, this differential almost inevitably increases. Faced as they are now with fresh cutbacks in the federal and in the state budgets, with high inflation, with reluctant taxpayers, with families and students who find it increasingly difficult to keep pace with rapidly rising tuition and other fees: — faced with all these, as well as with the

intrinsic financial dilemmas of any handicraft industry, universities simply have to assume that their financial circumstances will continue to be very difficult indeed.

Second, it may be thought that institutions with large endowments may be better off than institutions without endowments. In some theoretical way — and, I suppose, some practical way — this is true; having an endowment is certainly better than not having one. However, it is not generally well understood — although librarians are likely to be painfully aware of the fact — that institutions which are dependent upon endowment income are peculiarly vulnerable in a time of inflation, and the more of your revenue that depends upon endowment income, the more you are being eroded. The reason is only too clear: if inflation averages 10-12 percent in any given year, then a university must reinvest at least that much from endowment earnings simply in order to maintain the purchasing power of its fund. After a reinvestment of this magnitude, there is not likely to be very much left over from the annual yield. At Princeton, we estimate that we can generally expect the spendable income from endowment earnings to rise at a rate of about 6 percent a year. But if average costs are rising at a rate of 10-12 percent — or, as in the case of energy or scientific journal subscriptions, at a much higher rate — then it is easy to see the enormous gap that swiftly opens up between revenues and expenditures. As a colleague of mine recently said, everything that depends on endowment gets worse off every year.

In addition to the endowment "squeeze," nearly all of our institutions will be affected — one way or another — by the coming, highly-publicized demographic squeeze. The primary college-going population — the "pool" of 18-year olds — will decrease progressively throughout the 1980's, simply because there were fewer and fewer children born in the 1960's and early 1970's. In fact, the number of 18-year olds will be between 20-25 percent fewer by the time we reach 1990. Equally important, and this is not so often recognized, the mix of students among the 18-year-old population will be a very different mix. It was not just that there were altogether fewer prospective students born in the '60s and early '70s, it is also that the upper-middle class and middle-middle class families had disproportionally fewer. Thus, the proportion of low-income, inner-city 18-year olds -- many of them minority students and many of them Spanish-speaking — will grow significantly, even as the total number of 18-year olds declines. These low-income and minority students will mainly be attending just those secondary schools which have been hardest hit in their capacity to provide quality education. So American higher education will be facing not simply a dramatic drop in the number of potential college students, but an equally dramatic change in the mix, with a larger and larger proportion being less well trained.

We cannot really estimate with much accuracy the total effect of this emerging development, because we do not know, for example, the extent to which the losses in the number of college-bound 18-year olds will be offset by larger enrollments of continuing education students, nor do we know how our secondary schools will respond to their own particular educational challenges in the 1980's. Nonetheless, we can be quite certain that a good number of institutions — possibly a great number — will suffer serious enrollment declines, with inevitable declines in income, and an inevitable reduction in the number of faculty and staff they can afford. In addition, many universities will modify substantial portions of their curricula in order to meet the needs of their changing student populations —

whether the needs be those of older continuing education students with quite special interests, or those of younger students who may require considerable work in basic skills.

If the undergraduate scene is complicated, the conditions for graduate education can be described only as distressing. The most recent and best study of the prospects for graduate education, primarily Ph.D. programs in arts and sciences, shows quite clearly that we can expect the situation to become more and more difficult over the course of the next 15 years, essentially because academic job openings will become scarcer and scarcer.

Since our tenured faculties are relatively young in average age — having been mainly promoted in the boom years of the 1960's and early 1970's — there will be fewer than average retirements in the next decade and a half. At Princeton, for example, we used to project an average of 12 retirements a year from a tenured faculty of about 400; between now and 1990, however, we project an average of only six retirements a year. Prospective Ph.D. students, in other words, must look forward to a drastic reduction in the number of tenured positions available in the profession. If we combine this fact with the fact that the cost of graduate education is rising very steeply, that fellowship support is steadily declining, and that compensation in the academic profession has suffered more seriously during these last inflationary years than the compensation of any other major profession, these matters demonstrate the extent to which graduate education in the arts and sciences fits the classical definition of a deeply depressed industry: a long, expensive, and rigorous training period is required to earn one's credentials, leading to a professional environment in which there are almost no jobs to begin with, few prospects for advancement, and an even smaller number of the horizon — with rather modest financial rewards to boot. In the face of all this, we should expect a dwindling supply of applications for arts and science Ph.D. programs in the 1980's, and we should expect to see some fundamental restructuring of much graduate education, including the actual loss of a number of Ph.D. programs throughout the country.

Finally, resources. While all of this is happening, universities will, I believe, have greater and greater difficulty finding, first, adequate funds for student financial aid (at both the undergraduate and graduate level); and, second, adequate funds for basic research in the sciences and engineering. We all know that the federal cutbacks in these programs are already beginning to be felt by many institutions, and this effect is by no means only or mainly an economic one. Without strong federal grant and loan programs, many students and their families will not be able to afford the expense of a university education, especially the expense of high-cost private institutions. Without strong federal support for basic research, the intellectual capital of the nation's scientific enterprise, the productivity of its industry will certainly be eroded over time. The health of our libraries, moreover, is obviously directly related to the health of our sponsored research enterprise; they are closely linked financially as well as intellectually, because a significant portion of the indirect cost monies collected from sponsored projects is dedicated to general library support. At Princeton, this is a sizeable contribution, amounting to several hundred thousand dollars this year. In other words, if scientific research falls off, there are bound to be repercussions for our libraries, as well as for nearly all other parts of our institutions.

What I have described so far are a number of the major factors we must take into account in any effort to describe the situation facing universities in the 1980's. Although I have highlighted those matters which are likely to be the most troublesome for us, I believe this emphasis is realistic. Many "objective" and relatively predictable developments will be adverse in nature, and there is nothing to be gained from ignoring them. At the same time, I also believe that some favorable changes can — and almost certainly will — take place, depending on how our institutions respond to the problems they are facing. If our institutions are as good as I think they are, they are going to resist in the right way — not blindly and foolishly, but with energy and initiative. Indeed, some quite good things may flow even from our adversity. Even if we do reasonably well, however, our circumstances will be, at best, extremely demanding, and resources will be anything but plentiful. I suppose the only thing I would remind you of is that some new initiatives may not make life any less expensive; in my experience, almost every good thing we do — especially everything to save costs — ends up being at least as expensive, if not more so, including automation. If we take this as a promise, and bear in mind the other factors I have described, we ought to ask more directly what implications they hold for the management and administration of our universities and our research libraries. In this respect, I want to mention just four rather basic implications, followed by a few more particular ones.

First, it seems clear to me that we must plan for a considerable amount of complicated and significant institutional change. The worriesome items I mentioned earlier in this talk are all absolutely fundamental to the structure and functioning of universities: changes in the number and "mix" of undergraduate students; probable modifications of undergraduate curricula; a steady decline in the number of arts and science Ph.D. students, together with changes in the stability and design of many graduate programs of study; probable reductions in the support for basic research, as well as for student financial aid, and so forth. Unless we take the initiative, positively transforming some of these situations, while adjusting skillfully to others in such a way as a minimize shock and damage, we run the risk of suffering great losses in institutional quality. Only recently, universities were being described as entering a period of "steady state"; but I feel certain that, at least in many important respects, the coming period will be neither very steady nor very stately.

My second basic point is simply this: in the midst of so much relative scarcity and so many forced budget reductions, there will simultaneously be increased and often quite legitimate pressure for expanded capacity. Instrumentation in many of the sciences grows more complex and expensive every day. New important academic disciplines continue to develop. The demand for computer resources is spiralling. Libraries must have more space, more sophisticated bibliographic and other information, etc. It is often said that we are entering a "no growth" phase, but this idea — as we all know — is obviously misleading. There is, and must be, selective growth all the time, if you want to be as good in 1990 as you were in 1980. But this process, of course, creates serious managerial dilemmas: how do we make the case for new resources to promote growth, or how do we gain support for significant shifts of resources from one sector to another? How do we decide, in the first place, which projects really deserve long-range support?

My final two general points follow from this last one: that the continued pressure on all resource decisions will compel us to analyze and improve all of our managerial systems, whether they concern budgeting, staff management and

training, services, or other operations. We will need better information to support all of our proposals and decisions. In this sense, there will be an increasing premium on good management. At the same time — and somewhat paradoxically — it will be equally important to remember that management and leadership are not necessarily the same thing, and that strong leadership really will be critical in the years ahead. Better information systems and modes of analysis are absolutely essential tools; yet we also know that it is possible to do quite competent analyses of problems without actively coming to the right conclusions. There is no substitute for real ideas — one good idea is worth six mediocre studies — and these ideas often depend as much on imagination and an intuitive grasp of situations as they do on "method." Especially in a university environment, it is obviously crucial to be in close touch with the evolving academic and educational goals of the institution, and to be in constant contact with the faculty, in order to be able — through conviction and one's personal qualities — to "lead" as well as to manage.

My concluding comments — specifically about libraries — will be very brief, essentially because I cannot conceive of being able to say anything that you do not know already. From my vantage point, however, the following issues seem to me to be of greatest importance in the years ahead.

First, acquisitions. I start with the assumption that the wide gap between the number of serious books published each year and the number that any single library can buy will remain great, and may widen even further. That means we will have to give even more intensive and systematic thought to the whole process of acquisitions, especially as graduate school (and other) programs change. It means creating ways to make better-informed selections; it means that faculty and staff selectors must have clear budgetary responsibilities; that coordinated collection development among neighboring institutions will become more important; and so forth. It may be, of course, that as graduate education contracts, there will be opportunities for some cost-savings. But it will be hazardous to take too short-sighted a view of such situations. And it may also be the case that as universities search for continuing education and other students to replace 18-year olds, they will also place new demands on their library acquisitions budgets.

Second, related to acquisitions, we need to find ways of dealing more effectively with problems created by publishers and other groups outside the library. A start has been made on the problem of defining standards for the quality of paper to be used in book-publishing. In addition, it would clearly be helpful if ways could be found to mitigate the fiercely-rising costs of many scientific journals. We need to have a study of what is causing the differential rises in these journals and indeed get to publishers and other involved parties to try to put some dampening effect on this, or even persuade the academic associations to take these journals elsewhere and have them produced more cheaply. Otherwise, the shape of our acquisitions budgets will be very badly distorted in short order.

Third, delivery systems. If we assume that our various bibliographic information networks will soon be closely linked, we can expect library users to have access to a greater and greater fund of knowledge about the books they might wish to consult. Yet, simultaneously, given the acquisitions problems already mentioned, they can expect to have a smaller and smaller proportion of such volumes on hand in their own library. The cumulative effect of these contrary developments — more bibliographic information but proportionally fewer books — will soon begin to place

very great pressure on the problem of delivery systems. It seems to me that we need to isolate and attack the delivery-system problem even more intensively than we have done so far, at both the regional and national levels. We are building a frustration model. As we get better and better at sharing bibliographic information and worse and worse at buying books, we are asking for trouble, and we must either explain to people that they can find out where everything is but cannot have any of it, or we must find ways of getting them to it or it to them better than we do now.

Fourth, space will remain extremely expensive to build, and even more expensive to maintain. I assume in addition that we will have essentially no extra money to invest in new staff positions. At Princeton, for example, it has been several years since we have had net additions to staff — indeed, as we have automated some functions, we have paid for the automation through staff reductions. In general, we will have to continue to find imaginative and more efficient solutions to space and staffing needs, and we will need to find persuasive ways of explaining what we are doing, and why.

Fifth, automation. Clearly, in a lot of areas, we will have to keep ahead. What are the big problems? Up-front money, evaluation of the systems to make sure they are really going to deliver properly, and then planned transition so everybody does not have either heart failure or a nervous breakdown with all the things being tried out and installed, etc. Use of automation will increase in several areas: acquisitions, delivery systems, etc. The only thing to be wary of — as I am sure you all know — is that it always costs more; it never costs less. If you can find a machine to do exactly what that one staff person is doing, it will do so faster and cheaper. The trouble is, they do not design such a machine, but rather they design a machine to do 20 other things as well, while everybody wants it to do 30 more things! So, you increase your capacity for funding more things, and that, of course, increases your costs, and there you are in that dilemma. We are going to have to carry out projects and muddle through it. But it will mean more staff training, better control, better evaluation systems, more thoughtful selection of all that hardware, and worries about how to keep it up once we have it.

Finally, just two last points. While we control our costs, while we do all the other crazy things, it is terribly important to remember that we must not be shortsighted. These are the great libraries and the great collections. And, unless the collections are preserved properly, unless we buy rightly, wisely, prudently but still as much in the major fields as we can afford, unless we are the engine for the academic enterprises of teaching and learning, then there is really not all that much to be gained from just controlling costs. There is just not all that much to be gained from balancing the budget, unless the intellectual heritage is there with quality and shape, and usable for the future. Without this, all the rest of our little gyrations will not make any difference.

So, let us not be shortsighted in cutting costs; though we have to cut some, we must preserve the fundamental fields and preserve the basic collections, letting them grow in the right way. It will be more important 50 years from now, I promise you, than anything else — which is related to my second, very practical point.

Quality is crucial, not just to surviving, but to be able to survive at the highest level and in the best way, in terms of quality of performance, of attracting additional resources. The quickest way to go down the drain is to cut costs in such a

way that nobody is interested in you any more. The best way to preserve the strength of libraries and universities is to keep them strong; keep the quality up, persuade people that they are worth investing in and that you are going to control the budget. You are going to fight the battle, but they must give you the resources if they want these precious institutions to survive. So, paradoxically, getting more resources depends on maintaining our quality and making that demonstration in such a way that people will invest in us. If we do that, I believe they will invest in us. I believe we will remain strong, and that we can beat these problems!

* * * * * *

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Dr. Rudenstine. Those were very helpful comments. I am tempted to call this "The Decade to Dread," rather than a no-growth period. We now have an opportunity for questions or comments from the floor.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Everybody is stunned!

MR. HARRER (University of Florida): Do you see as an alternative to periodical publications in hard copy any sort of system of electronic storage and distribution of research that will serve the purpose, or does "publish or perish" mean you must be in print on paper?

MR. RUDENSTINE: There is, of course, that side of the engine, isn't there! Unless up and coming faculty members can have their material read and circulated and all the rest of it, it will be hard for them and hard for learning, on the whole. I believe we can make some gains in the direction you mentioned. I am not technically-expert enough to be able to make the judgment, but my experience suggests to me that these developments come more slowly than you have guessed. One always hears stories about how quickly we are going to be able to transfer information. It turns out to be enormously expensive, as you know. There will be some breakthroughs, but I do not see electronic publishing, in ten years, materially affecting the whole problem. That is why I like to beat on the publishers, quite honestly.

MR. JOHNSON (Emory University): Could you comment about the faculty perspectives that you see, and to what degrees are faculties accepting the kind of presentation you have just made? We all agree with what you have said, and I think that is why you are not getting more questions! But, one of the problems we tend to see is the different perspective of faculty and researchers.

MR. RUDENSTINE: To what extent do faculties agree with all this? That varies tremendously, obviously, from person to person and institution to institution. A lot depends on how much, quite honestly, your budget officers and provosts are working to help you and I believe that is an area where we have to make more progress. We have had a tremendous effort for a few years to present to faculties, more often than they would wish, all the financial details that are hounding us. Our major budget committee has faculty on it. I make four presentations a year to our university council; I will make two presentations to the faculty about the budget, and I keep reminding them all the time. So, I would say, you can soak them, you can

marinate them, you can indoctrinate them into a vision that is closer to reality. Even that will not solve all our problems, because there is always the question of "Well, I know it's right, but use the means of that person over there!" Nonetheless, I believe you can create a much more realistic environment than, five or ten years ago, we expected you might create.

MR. McDONALD (University of Connecticut): Maybe my question is a corollary to the previous one. You spoke of the need to continue to grow, and I think we all believe in that. No library wants to be a block on the legitimate aspirations of the faculty. So, we will have productive growth, let us say. But, is there anything that we are willing to give up in the universities? Is there program evaluation and reduction going on? I do not see it.

MR. RUDENSTINE: Is there anything we are willing to give up, and is there program evaluation and reduction? Again, I can really only speak to our experience at Princeton. We have, since 1970, put the entire university through the wringer three times, in 1970/71, 1973/74, and 1978/79. Each of those times, we have taken between one and two million dollars out of the operating budget base, in reductions in staff, reductions in faculty, reductions in operating budget, reductions in programs. We have dropped, totally, one graduate program; we have trimmed, substantially, four graduate programs, and cut back two or three undergraduate programs, to the point where they are able to function only in a very different way. We have dropped other administrative staff, dozens and dozens of positions, etc. We accept the fact that every third to fourth year, Princeton simply has to count on trying to take one to three million dollars out of the operating budget. It can be and must be done — otherwise, we will all be ruined. This ought to be a systematic expectation on everybody's part. Our faculty does not like it, but expects it. It is simply established as a rhythm now.

MR. FRANTZ (University of Virginia): Have you found that part of the problem is not only dropping programs that exist, but not approving programs that are coming up? It often is an unwritten law in faculty meetings that you do not shoot down your colleague's new program and also an unwritten law that the library is usually the last to hear about program changes. Sometimes, a department will propose a program that is marginal, but it is very hard for other colleagues to say "No, we should not have that," without internecine warfare breaking out! Do you see that as part of the difficulty?

MR. RUDENSTINE: It is part of the difficulty — no question. Sometimes the programs, alas, are legitimate, and you have to approve them. Sometimes you can do without them. Here again, I think, in every institution, you need help from the president, the dean, and the provost. And, you need better structures for coordination. You must have people on the curriculum committee. If you have a curriculum committee, you must have the provost or someone at that point to say, "Well, what about the impact here!" Our curriculum committee, before it approves a single academic course or program, requires that the department submit a standard memo, with a line item asking "What are the new resources that will be required for this," i.e., faculty, library resources, operating expenses, etc. And, before the dean of the faculty or I will approve it, we have to make sure either we have the resources in our budget or that we can get it into our budget or in our cash flows, or whatever. Right at this moment, Don Koepp does not know it, but we are holding up two programs. One of them looks simply like a faculty position. But if

that faculty position were approved, it would have enormous consequences for the library, for the art museum, and several other places, and we must simply say "no," until we know where all the resources are coming from.

So, I do not mean to say there is perfection out there, but there are systems. A lot depends upon how your curriculum is generated and who approves it, and where does the proposal for a new course go, is there budgetary officer at the other end of it with a form that can be sent back, saying, "it's marvellous! How much is it going to cost, and do you have the resources?" And, they may not have the resources, but you think it is so important to the institution that you must do it, anyway, and you have made a "priority" decision, and have not just fallen into something. You must look at you own internal system.

PLANNED CHANGE IN ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONS

Herbert R. Kells
Rutgers University

MR. WEBSTER: The notion of pressure for change leads naturally to the next discussion. We are going to look at some of the strategies for introducing and managing change, particularly in academic organizations. The second speaker this morning is Dr. Herbert Kells, Professor of Higher Education and Information at the Rutgers University Graduate School of Library and Information Studies. He graduated from Rutgers with degrees in the fields of Applied Biochemistry and Microbiology, and has worked at a variety of institutions, including Harper College, the State University of New York at Binghamton, and Claremont College. He was formerly Associate Executive Secretary of the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, where he worked with over 300 institutions in developing his model for institutional self-study, and he is actively engaged in training campus teams to pursue the self-study process at their institutions. Dr. Kells will discuss "Planned Change in Academic Organizations," drawing on lessons learned from a decade of experience with institutional self-study.

MR. KELLS: When Duane asked me to speak here today, I was reluctant at first. Even though I am situated at the Rutgers Graduate School of Library and Information Studies and teach there part of my time, and even though I have known some of the people in this room for almost 20 years, from Binghamton, Rutgers, and California, I am not a librarian. My question was, "Why should they listen to me at all." But, an experience I had about six months ago came back to convince me that perhaps I should say "yes." I do training for self-study processes in colleges and universities for four of the six regional accrediting associations in the United States. One of them is the Northeast Association. Last August, after running a three-day workshop near Seattle, I was waiting in a pasteboard-type motel for an early flight home, and could not sleep. I turned on the television, and a person some of you may have seen, Leo Buscaglia — a Professor of Education at the University of Southern California — captured my attention. He is a charismatic speaker and has the ability to keep gymnasia full of people in rapt attention. That evening, he was talking about listening, emphasizing that we do not listen very well to one another. He told a story of a man driving a car on a mountain road. Of course, it was the typical dangerous situation, with fog on the road, no guard rail to keep him from going off the side, treacherous conditions. Around the curve came another car in the middle of the road. He swerved, just enough, and in that brief second when the car went by, a woman put her head out of the window of the other car and said, "Pig!" Naturally, it startled him. He was threatened, anyway; his heart was beating, and it just overcame him. He turned and put his head out the window and yelled after her, "Swine!" He went around the corner — and ran into a pig!

I would like to share with you today some of my ten years of experience with self-assessments in various settings. It has been marvelous experience, but I must say, in looking back at these efforts on the part of colleges and universities to look at themselves in useful ways, it is not a very good picture, and it is not very encouraging. In many self-assessment efforts, the potential of the studies -- for the

organization, for the students, for the faculty members, for the users of research libraries — is great. I feel strongly that self-assessment is important, and that its potential for institutional improvement is great — it is just rarely realized. Today, I am going to put forth some postulates that I would suggest you follow when you are approached by ARL or other agencies to engage in self-assessment and, therefore, influence the planned change of your organization.

I will begin with a historical note and a suggestion about the politics and power relationships in organizations. The most interesting work I have read about this subject is that of Burton Clark, lately of Yale, now of UCLA, in a short, very well-written, and popular version of his important work about power in American organizations, particularly colleges and universities, entitled "The Benefits of Disorder."[1] I recommend it to you. What Burton Clark does is to consider how universities have evolved, where the power is in our organization, and what that means for us. He points out that our system of colleges and universities is not run from the top; is not nationally organized, there is no ministry of anything telling us what to do. This provides some marvelous advantages: competitive pressures, flexibility, responsiveness. And, I would argue, these continue even under some of the conditions very ably described by Professor Rudenstine. But, what that situation brings for us, and one of the things I would like to talk about today, is the many people wanting to mind our business.

Because we are relatively autonomous, we do, therefore, seem to relate, and we are asked to relate, to many levels of many organizations. There is a concatenation of demands complicating our institutional lives. Many agencies and interests seek documentation about our colleges and our libraries: parent institutions, state agencies, consumer interests, the press, professional agencies and associations, and federal bodies.

There is no need for me to rehearse the external pressures which bombard American postsecondary institutions, and your libraries in particular. We are all aware of the multi-faceted and often overwhelming demands placed on administrators and faculties as well as the professionals in our libraries. Some of the most interesting work about that has been done in this area characterizes our academic professionals as being placed in a situation where they must endure multiphasic work overloads, trained for only part of what they do, pulled in about six or eight different directions. It is very difficult to ask those people to engage in some of the processes we consider through the OMS and in response to other requests. But, much can be learned by examining the experience of self-assessment attempts conducted under these conditions by colleges, primarily for regional accrediting agencies.

These agencies are an attempt at self-regulation and self-improvement by institutions in a particular region. They promote improvement by promoting self-assessment processes and by employing peer evaluation teams and accreditation teams and councils. One of their major messages, "know and improve yourself," is often misunderstood because of the anxiety levels associated with peer review, by federal funds eligibility, and by other aspects of the process. The agencies find that institutions do not seem to have much ongoing assessment capacity, and that periodic, organized, participative self-assessment exercises are rarely related to coherent, useful planning ventures as part of a cycle. These agencies find that institutions would rather not engage in the required self-study process. That they do

so reluctantly and, therefore, usually enter into an overly descriptive, mechanical, poorly-led, somewhat "safe," often politicized, multi-committee venture. Such a process leads to the production of a fat, barely manageable report. Indeed, the process too often seems to have been organized to write the report rather than to study the institution. Such reports are bound, stacked, sent, and forgotten, as far as the life of the institution is concerned. Sometimes useful changes result, but the potential for broad-scale institutional renewal, assisted by useful assessment of peers, is largely unfulfilled in these efforts.

The institution's reaction to such regional stimulus to self-study and review is mixed. The leaders usually tout the benefits of a peer-based process, particularly in preference to a government process, and usually after it is over. But, before the review, with some notable and increasingly frequent exceptions, they abhor the diversion, and complain about the waste of time and funds. Larger institutions, such as research universities which contain or are related to research libraries and which often have multiple accreditation relationships, often stagger under the weight of the system. The institutions usually see the self-study requirements as compounding state-mandated study and planning requirements and any locally-initiated efforts. Reactions of administrators and faculty members range from "more busy work" to a deep resentment about the usurping of time which they feel is better employed in providing teaching or other services or research. It is not hard to understand their reaction, when one considers that one public university in the Northeast was recently visited 40 times in one three-year period, with most of the visits requiring some kind of prior self-assessment.

What do the state agencies perceive about these assessment efforts? It is no surprise that as the economic situation grows worse and as state coordinating boards gain power, state agencies have been increasing their demands that institutions study and plan, coordinate, cooperate and evaluate — almost constantly. Very little of it is coordinated with institutional or accrediting schedules, and most of it assumes that filling out forms and answering questions is the essence of an assessment. Institutions grow weary and angry, aware that many of their responses to such efforts are not that useful, and confident that more of the same is surely not the answer. They question most of the simplistic assumptions and methods and what they see is a gross lack of sensitivity to the nature of the academic endeavor. They react strongly, often politically, and an adversarial situation usually develops with both sides losing steadily in the resulting climate.

At the institutional level — i.e., with respect to those efforts that occasionally are started by institutions without external stimulus — many of these same reasons pertain. Unfortunately, the leaders of our institutions are rarely able to sort out the demand for study and planning imposed by external sources, and certainly have difficulty developing a local agenda for study, planning, and action amid these constant and often conflicting demands. In the absence of a strong, locally-initiated agenda or, if you will, management philosophy and process, the style is, perforce, reactive and wasteful. The same band of hardworking folk on the campus are dragooned into service in a seemingly never-ending sequence of studies, planning efforts, "commissions to chart the future," mission and goal efforts, MBO superimpositions, program review — you name it. Few institutions have decided to collapse it all into a logical sequence of locally-centered study, planning, implementing, and repeat. As conditions worsen and the incidence of other than improvement-oriented studies (e.g., cost-efficiency studies in order to cut back

programs) increases, the prospect for establishing such control, for securing a reversal in the conditions, and for improving the nature of institutional self-assessment certainly grows dimmer, particularly with respect to the largely politicized institutions.

There is one other important aspect which must be addressed concerning institutionally-initiated assessment efforts. It is the matter of technique and expertise. A most perplexing reality permeates almost every setting I have seen. Neither campus leaders nor other professionals — at least not those drafted into service in the assessment effort — seem to have a clear view of how to go about the task. They have neither a usable theory nor a model which they can call forth to be the basis for the effort, nor do they seem to have a reasonable level of expertise. They flounder for a system, a "handle." Many grab at the first plausible, understandable approach which is suggested or that comes along at a reasonable price. They do not seem to bring the same level of professionalism to tasks like assessment or planning that they surely must apply to the pursuit of knowledge in their own disciplines. This sad condition, of course, also rears its head concerning other major aspects of the management role — organizing, budgeting, staffing, training, and the like. It is for these reasons that some of us have attempted to run self-study workshops, and the reason why at least my book, Self-Study Processes[2], was written.

So, this self-assessment landscape is complex and discouraging. What I would like to do is suggest a few things that I think would help, at least a bit. First, some more theoretical considerations, then several practical suggestions. I would not think of accepting an assignment as a consultant to another organization, or going on a consultation or accreditation team to another institution — be it a university or a library — unless I had a set of theoretical and practical postulates with which to look at organizations. How does one assess the effectiveness of an organization? It was one of the things that plagued me most in my experience at Middle States — the difficultly that these organizations have in taking experienced, willing, often eager evaluation committee members and training them to do their role well on someone else's campus. In preparing staff members for accrediting agencies and for associations like this and all the others, it seems that we need more clarity about how we should proceed. Here are several considerations of mine.

The first is that the primary motivation of the assessment effort usually determines its effectiveness. Basically, assessments can be internally motivated and directed or externally motivated. Both of these can result in some institutional improvement. Although external requests are often helpful — some leverage helps sometimes — it is at least an order of magnitude more difficult to create useful change in the case of a mere response to an external stimulus. Both kinds of motivations require that some local criteria levels be set or employed, indicating worthiness or significance in regard to the problem or deficit in a particular program or activity, but the internally-motivated process is usually locally determined and controlled by the professionals who must use the results of their determinations and who are therefore (potentially) motivated to solve the given problem and implement the solution. On the contrary, the externally-motivated study often imposes criteria, methods, and procedures determined elsewhere (unfortunately, usually not predictively valid ones) which may or may not be applicable locally and may or may not result in useful, constructive development at

the institution. As a second part of this, it is possible to reorient externally-initiated processes to become internally-motivated processes.

Closely linked to that little postulate is the second one. The effectiveness of an institution should be assessed using two basic complementary strategies: 1) the relationship between goals and your sense of goal-achievement, and 2) how well the institution seems to function as an ongoing, responsive, vital organization. By goal achievement I mean assessment over time, using a system — e.g. facts and opinions — developed by your own people to look at the extent to which your intentions for your organization or program seem to be achieved. Goal achievement studies cannot prove that the institution caused the outcomes which are ascertained because of the lack of controls and the variation in input and intervening or external variables. If studies are undertaken for improvement purposes, the studies can look for patterns of outcomes which should but which do not occur. Then basic elements or focal points for examination, development, and change have been created. This is an absolutely critical dimension for assessors and for those planning self-assessment studies to understand — and it is usually misunderstood.

The third suggestion. Since institutions are run by people, assessment must be accomplished by people. This has very important implications for the leadership of the process and for process design. The design of the process must match the institutional circumstances, and the steps, sequences, roles, tasks, and organization of the process must be psychologically acceptable and appropriate in terms of the leader's interest and posture. Basically, if the leader is enthusiastic that the process be successful it has a much better chance of being successful. The availability of useful information about the program (institutional research) and a long list of other variables also affect the design and, therefore, the result of these processes, but the people-oriented and design dimensions are critical.

And finally, an assessment effort must yield to strategies for a commitment to useful change. This is the most common shortcoming I have found in reviewing hundreds of study processes, evaluation schemes, and resultant reports. Most point out, or intend to point out, "areas of need," "problems," or even "recommendations." But the process usually stops short of institutional commitment to change or even to study priorities, roles, etc. Such a process is, therefore, not ongoing. There are no links to the future. It is isolated and most of the effort is wasted.

I would like to offer a few practical suggestions in light of these basic postulates. First, to the maximum extent possible, invert all externally-initiated assessment efforts to become internally designed and motivated assessment efforts. This is an important task that the leadership must undertake. It assumes, of course, that the institutional leadership cares about improvement and is open enough to permit local professionals to periodically and frankly assess progress in meeting goals and to study the way the institution functions. And, sadly, some of our leaders at American colleges and universities are not too comfortable with that. This also presumes that state or other external agencies — the people who come and ask you to do things — care about institutional improvement and that they are wise enough to see that such a strategy of orienting the study to internal needs and agendas is better in the long run, and can also meet the short run needs of the agency. It also recognizes that various criteria can be used to point to strengths and weaknesses, and that some of these may well be suggested and/or adopted locally. It also recognizes that, even in potentially adversarial situations, an improvement-oriented

strategy can be adopted and can be made to work over time. (Those of you that are associated with major American universities might be interested in a recent article by Arns and Poland, in the Journal of Higher Education, addressing that topic.[3] They specifically give some experience about planning and assessment efforts in adversarial situations.)

When entering into an OMS study, I would suggest that a basic decision ought to be made whether the self-study is conducted to improve management or to improve the library. Whenever possible, I suggest the latter. Internally-oriented processes can yield valuable insight, political advantage through self-awareness and confidence, improved morale, and useful results. Externally-oriented processes, which are "paste-on", partially informed, superficial, and reactive rather than proactive, are always expensive, showing very little, if any, useful results for the funds and time invested.

The second thing I would suggest is that you vigorously establish and maintain the institution's own cyclical agenda for study and complementary planning activities. This should be the primary and the controlling agenda. Do not add an ARL self-study on top of, or next to, three or four major other studies, reviews, market or other surveys in departments. Make it part of the basic thrust; integrate it or do not do it. This recognizes that institutions want to reduce duplication and presumes that institutional leaders want and can benefit from a solid, useful, periodic cycle of study and planning. Many institutions do not have a useful cycle of study and planning, and if agencies reduce the duplication and mindlessness by even 50 percent, institutions can be guided to establish other schemes. There is no "free lunch" in the self-assessment business, but it would be nice to be able to control the menu, to decide that lunch can and should be served some time between 11:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., and even to enjoy the food now and then.

Third suggestion: design the process well. Start with an overview of the status quo — problems, goals, staff member weariness, availability of information, any goal achievement or other related studies, the extent of staff turnover, the nature of the informal leadership in the institution, the priorities, the local agenda for the next couple of years. Build the process, its depth, breadth, participation level, steps, and sequence of activity with the foregoing in mind. Use a sequence. Use intensive rather than mindlessly protracted activities. It is possible to do many of the things we ask people to do in these processes by scheduling them at the right time, with pre-task planning, so that the information they need is available. Many stages can be conducted in a concentrated week-end seminar or retreat, with the right people at the right time, with the right questions and the right information.

My fourth suggestion is to include the commitment to act, to develop, to change, or whatever is called for, as part of the assessment process. This means that the reports that result from the process (remember, the reports are not the process, and the primary purpose of the process is not the writing of the reports) should include agendas for action, priorities, schedules, roles, and tasks.

I brought along something else. This is a self-study report produced by a 6,000-student institution, which is a result of a well-designed study process. It has recommendations for change and strategies to achieve it, with respect to every major aspect of the institution. The report is readable; it can be put in a raincoat pocket, and read by a busy board or foundation member. It has many other uses.

The self-study process was not conducted on that campus to produce this report. This is an important result, but just one of the results of that process.

So, that is my agenda. It is a relatively simple enough agenda. Make the study internal, integrate it into a usable, ongoing cycle of self-study and planning that you control. Design the process well, for the proper use of human resources, with intensive activities, good leadership, and a host of other things which I touched on very briefly today. And, plan to achieve results from the very time you start to design the process.

I think it will take years for many of us to reduce the assessment morass, and replace it with simpler institutionally-based, useful, accountable scheme. But, it is worth the effort. I applaud the ARL effort in self-study, and I think you are launched on the right track, with the staff you have, to consider these materials. Thank you for listening.

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Herb. As you can tell, Herb is not a blind disciple of the self-study process. Certainly, his experience is consistent with some of my experience, particularly with regard to the notion of motivation, use of available processes, the orientation, the commitment to change, and the responsibility for executive leadership to the management of that process.

* * * * *

References:

1. Clark, Burton R. "The Benefits of Disorder," Change, v. 8, no. 9 (October 1976): 31-37.
2. Kells, Herbert R. Self-Study Processes: A Guide for Postsecondary Institutions. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1980.
3. Arns, Robert G. and William Poland. "Changing the University through Program Review," Journal of Higher Education. v. 51, no. 3 (May/June): 268-284.

THE ROLE AND CONTRIBUTION OF LIBRARIANS TO CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Paul Pohlman
University of Chicago

MR. WEBSTER: The third speaker this morning is Dr. Paul Pohlman, Co-director of Management Institutes of the Human Resources Center at the University of Chicago. His undergraduate work was accomplished at Cornell, his graduate studies completed at the University of Chicago. His specialty is organizational education and development programs. These programs involve work with both private and public sector organizations, analyzing needs and developing and implementing educational programs for managers. As Co-director of the Management Institute, Dr. Pohlman engages in teaching, administration, faculty coordination, and consultation with organizations interested in developing their own staffs. I first met Paul about five years ago, when he was working with the University of Chicago Library on an organizational development project aimed at constructive involvement of the library staff in a systematic planning and problem-solving effort. His experience provides him an excellent basis on which to discuss the recasting of library organizations, to make a more productive and challenging and rewarding setting for academic libraries.

MR. POHLMAN: Thanks, Duane.

I thought I was — and introduced myself earlier today as — a management educator. But then, Neil Rudenstine got up and made a nice distinction between "leadership" and "management." And now I consider myself a "leadership" educator! I take it that management, the way Neil was using it, really takes a look at the whole control process: planning, budgeting, making decisions, being systematic, etc. The work I do with libraries and librarians is really leadership training, i.e., getting librarians together and looking at how they take initiative, how they develop their staff. I have worked with a number of libraries, including the University of Chicago Library and the Center for Research Libraries. I have even been out in the woods with a group of public librarians -- they happened to all be women; I have not yet lived that down — in a "retreat" setting, doing some leadership training. So, the leadership training that I do in libraries is really looking at an individual's interpersonal skills and interpersonal competence in working with his or her staff.

What I would like to do for a few minutes is talk about and put myself in the role of one of your staff members. Let us say that I am one of your department heads, and you have come back from an Association meeting and are talking to me about "effectiveness." I hear this word "effectiveness" often nowadays. (Monday, I was at the convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. A number of Ronald Reagan's people from Washington were there, including Secretary of Labor Donovan. And, as they were talking about costs and cost-effectiveness ratios, they seemed to use the word "effectiveness" in terms of looking at and making political decisions about programs. But I think we have to use it in terms of effectiveness of our human resources and how we manage our human resources.) So, here you come back; you are talking to me about "effectiveness." I might well think of that as pressure on me: so the head of my research library wants me, in some

way, to be more effective. Should I act defensively? Should I circle the wagons, so to speak, and say, "Well, we are already effective, in my department; what will we do to increase effectiveness?"

One way — and I think Neil was suggesting it — that we might have to act in the future is to trim our staffs. Neil also used the words: "put through the ringer." Last year, our organization at the University of Chicago reduced its staff by half. It is always difficult to trim staff. (The only "trimming" I used to do was on the Christmas tree; I would trim a little bit, and take a few branches off. I thought when people said "trimming staff," they might bring in Weight Watchers and have everybody trim a little off. But that is, in fact, not what it means.) So, sometimes, in terms of improving our effectiveness, we might have to trim staff. But, let me consider the "effectiveness" issue in this instance mainly as an opportunity for me as one of your department heads to work with you to develop my capabilities and abilities as a manager.

The adult education literature today talks a lot about "competencies." Our people are exceptionally competent. And, what are their competencies? To do what they are doing! And I take that to mean, "What knowledge and skills do they have to do what they, in fact, should be doing?" But, what I would like to do, as one of your department heads — because I am starting to feel an increase in this pressure on me to be more effective — is to engage you in a process, a simple process, which will lead to my development on an individual basis.

The first step in this process, I would suggest, is taking a look, with you, at my job: my functions and responsibilities, my relationship with my staff, and my relationship with you — not focusing on my personality but on the job that I have to do as the head of the department. In all the work we do with organizations and with libraries, we try to be job-focused, so that people get some understanding and some feeling for the responsibilities of their specific jobs. We probably have been talking for years — the two of us, you as the director and me as the department head — and so we probably already have some understanding. But, I would like to focus on the job and really challenge the two of us to take a good look at what the important priorities on the job are and what I really should be doing. I do not have time to do all the things I must do. I have had to trim staff and trim the budget; I have had to trim and trim, so I want to be clear, now, with you on what it is that I am to do — what my responsibilities and authorities are — so there is no misunderstanding between the two of us.

Now, the agenda I am working on is my own development. I want to become more effective, rather than just let the "effectiveness" pressure make me defensive and start to avoid problems. So, the second thing I want to do with you is to actually sit down and talk with you about the progress that my department and I have made on certain of the job functions or job areas that we have examined. I want to take a look at the progress specifically by an exchange of information in terms of my department. The more specific and the more open we can be with each other, the better off we are going to be. I want to build a good working relationship with you, so that we can, in fact, work on my development and my effectiveness as a manager. I also want to look at the problems I am having in some of the priority areas and identify those problems with you. And the third thing I want to do is take a look at some of those problems and develop some goals and objectives that I can begin working on with my staff to improve the way the department runs. I want to

be clear about that. I know you do not have much time and I know I am busy. But what we have got to do here is improve my effectiveness and that of my department. So, we must really sit down and work on that together to reach some decisions so that, once we establish some direction or even some criteria for evaluating what the outcome of that direction should be, then I would like, in the monthly meetings we have, to set up an evaluation process, so that you know and I know how things are going, so that the communication is clear, so that we do, in fact, evaluate the results.

Now, is there any way that can improve my abilities as a manager, my competencies if you will, in working through this program? Let us take just a quick example. Let us say, for example, that one of the areas that I am weak in, or that we have identified as a problem, is staff meetings with my department. We have agreed, in the past, that monthly meetings with the staff are a good idea. What has happened, in fact, is that I meet with my staff, but maybe only once a quarter. I do not like meetings; I am not a good meeting leader; I do not like to interact with many people at once. So, I have just let it slide. The only problem I can see that it has caused is that people do not seem to be quite as well informed as they might be, although I have also received some feedback on motivation. How can we, then, work on my management competencies, my management capacities, in this particular area? We have identified it as a priority item and as a problem, and now we must take a look at it and see if we can plan for my improvement, for developing my effectiveness as a manager. We must to try to lay out a plan. Perhaps you are a good leader of meetings and I will go to some of your meetings and observe you in action. Perhaps there is another department head who can help me out. The third way, the one I like the best, is to get my staff to give me feedback, or constructive criticism, at the end of each meeting. I can ask them the question openly: "How can I improve my meetings" and listen to the feedback I receive. Then I want to review the results of this plan with you to see if I can improve my effectiveness. I am talking primarily about "effectiveness," not in terms of the way the Reagan Cabinet is talking about "effectiveness," but in terms of my own management capacity, my own interpersonal competence, my own ability to lead. I want to lead my staff with energy. I want to take risks with them, I want to improve their effectiveness and, most of all, I want to help develop them — and I cannot, in fact, help develop them unless I am developing my own capacities.

This kind of approach is a self-help approach. It is really a process for individual development, based on a couple of key principles. One is that you and I are willing to build a good working relationship around the work itself, and the other is that I have some commitment to my own continuing development as a manager and professional in your organization.

I am going to stop here. I want to wish you good luck in developing your staff. Thank you very much.

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Paul. I appreciate those comments that complement the equation. We have talked about some of the pressures acting on research libraries, precipitating the need for processes for change. Self-study is one method for that. But, fundamentally, the equation has to include the elements of handling people's problems and improving managerial effectiveness, and I think you have covered that area very well.

PANEL DISCUSSION: OMS CAPABILITIES, FUNDING, AND PROGRAM AGENDA FOR THE '80s*

MR. WEBSTER: This part of the program is intended to build upon the earlier session. We have looked at some of the pressures and some of the opportunities facing us as managers in an academic setting. Members of the OMS Advisory Committee are going to continue, discussing in particular the evolution of the Office, some of the financial circumstances that we face at the present time, and the program agenda being developed for the next decade. We are going to leave a considerable amount of time for your comments, questions, and reactions to what the Office has been doing and what has been said this morning, and I would encourage you to provide us with your reactions.

I might also comment on the Advisory Committee structure that the Office enjoys. The Office was originally created as an outgrowth of work by a joint committee of ARL and the American Council on Education (ACE) on investigation of problems in university library management. In the early years, the joint committee was the major advisory mechanism for the Office. Subsequently, the ARL commissions were established, and the management commission specifically provided direct advice and assistance to the Office. In 1977, the Board established an advisory committee which includes at least one representative of the Board who chairs the committee, to work with the Office in reviewing plans and examining annually program priorities, not only in terms of accomplishment or progress made in accomplishing priorities from the previous year, but also in examining, very specifically, the major projects scheduled for the ensuing year. In that process of reviewing and monitoring our progress on priorities, there is a built-in expectation that we are attempting to be responsive to the needs and interests of the ARL directors. This session is another attempt, on our part, to test that. Members of the advisory committee are going to share with you some of their perspectives on how we have arrived at where we are today.

The first speaker is Page Ackerman, formerly the University Librarian at the University of California at Los Angeles and presently a visiting professor at the University of California at Berkeley School of Library and Information Studies. Page has had a rich career in librarianship and has made numerous contributions to both the profession and ARL. I have found her advice to be a mainstay in dealing with the evolving fortunes of OMS and she is particularly well-suited to reflect on where the Office has been and what it has accomplished, since she has worked with us, first as a library director and participant in the Management Review and Analysis Program, as a member of the ARL Board of Directors and, now, as a member of the OMS Advisory Committee.

MS. ACKERMAN: Thank you, Duane. I liked that part about my "rich career". Very nice! This morning, I plan to race through a very sketchy context for the discussion at the end of the session. In approaching it, I have asked myself three questions: what produced the OMS; what is it suppose to be and do; and, what made it what it is today? I plan to answer these questions, in an extremely selective way, saying something that I hope will be relevant to the open discussion we will have.

*As a background to the discussion, a Position Paper prepared by the OMS Advisory Committee was distributed to the Membership. See p. 94.

First, what produced OMS? A very special combination of circumstances and forces, I believe, and it is worth looking at that combination, and, perhaps, thinking about what kind of combination we may need in the future. In the first place, a new President of the Council on Library Resources, who was fresh from a university presidency at Washington and Lee, let it be known to the Board of the ARL that he and the Council had a deep and continuing concern about the improvement of library management. That was in 1967, and I can just say a few words that might remind you of the context within which librarians were working in 1967. Program budgeting, student unrest, accountability, steady-state, etc., had just come into the vocabulary, or at least recently for librarians who had been through a period of optimistic expansion, so that those forces put librarians in a frame of mind to be concerned about what they perceived to be steadily increasing expectations on the part of administration, staff, and students, and decreasing or stable resources with which to meet those expectations. Not surprisingly, then, the meeting of minds between the Council and the Board and Membership of ARL moved very quickly, resulting in the appointment of Booz, Allen and Hamilton (BAH) to do a study of the problems of library management.

When Booz, Allen and Hamilton completed the report, it found problems in every traditional area of management, including the relationships between libraries and university administrations, and in the cooperative relationships among libraries themselves. BAH also produced a plan for action and, as you know, out of that plan for action the management study of Columbia University developed, and the Office of the University Library Management Studies — as it was first named — was established, with Duane Webster as Director. Duane's first assignment was participating in that management study of Columbia University. So, in 1970, Mr. Webster went to Columbia and, in 1971, spent, apparently, a very active year. What he was doing was not very evident until his 1972 annual report came out. That report presents what I believe is the best statement of the path the OMS was to follow.

First, Duane reported that he had generalized the Columbia University study and had developed a basic management tool, primarily an assisted management self-study which he described as "guidelines for use in performing an internal study and evaluation of management policies, activities, and results." He had already, I believe, begun to recruit libraries to take part in that study. In the second part of the report, covering the future of OMS, Duane laid out what appears to me to be a path that has been followed, almost to the letter. In his "Remarks on the Future," this is the way he described the path ahead:

> Future activities of the Office will continue to draw on the experience of the Columbia study, MRAP*, and related projects, in order to make the findings available to libraries. This calls for a project orientation — that is, conduct of studies that will lead to the development of management tools. Product orientation will shift, in time, to a service orientation based on the products.

And there is this final statement:

*Management Review and Analysis Program

> Another shift in activity will be a move toward promoting the use of management tools and procedures rather than concentrating on research and development, for, in view of the limited capacity of the Office, it is doubtful that research can be given a major emphasis.

Now, what I would like to point out is that, in the early reports of Booz, Allen and Hamilton, there was a kind of theoretical, idealistic view that ARL should be responsible for mounting a comprehensive research program in practically all of the management fields that BAH had covered. This reduction in the scope of the program — which I think was wise and inevitable — is a departure from some of the original thinking of ARL and, to some extent, I think it is part of an unfinished agenda. The current programs of OMS appear to me to follow directly from the statement made by Duane in 1972: the Academic Library Program, which includes MRAP and all the sons of MRAP; the information services program; and the training services program. I would just like to say one or two things about what made them what they are today.

For one thing, they are reflections of circumstances. In the first place, and basically, they are the reflection of the original purpose of the BAH report, with certain modifications. They are also reflections of the basic research done at Columbia. All of the models that have been developed were based directly on that study. They have been revised, improved, adapted, applied in different ways to different areas, but that is where they came from. They are also based on the need to make the maximum return on the investment in staff and money that the Council on Library Resources, primarily, was making, at least for the first five years of the program. The staff, at that time, consisted of one professional; now it is six.

The programs also reflected the capabilities, the energies, and the limitations, of course, of the staff. But, beyond what it reflected, the OMS was influenced by two major agencies or groups of people. The first was ARL, collectively and as individual directors, in a variety of ways, from participating in and criticizing MRAP, to responding to the needs of the information services for suggestions, to participating in the training programs. The second major influence was the Council on Library Resources, without which I believe there would not have been an Office of Management Studies, and whose fiscal support made it possible for the Office to grow and to broaden in scope and depth. But, beyond the fiscal support, the relationship between the Council and the Office, the mutually-supportive interactions that have taken place between the staffs of these two agencies have enriched not only OMS but the Council's programs as well. One example of this is OMS publications; many of the research monographs resulted from the investment of the time of a Council fellowship intern on a subject. Although the program broadened to include non-ARL libraries, as I look back and as I read reports, it is hard for me to see any basic, major new influence on the scope or the depth of the program itself. The non-ARL libraries have provided opportunities for experience and they have profited; also, the funds these libraries have provided have allowed OMS to become more self-sufficient than it would otherwise have been.

I would like to end by saying that, in a way, the 80s are a new decade. The Office has been built into an integrated, responsive, mutually-supportive system of staff development and organizational development programs. It is mature, but it is still responding to the agenda of the '70s. The agenda of the '80s is the agenda that you must help the Office to determine. The many forces operating are the same as

we have heard this morning, but there are some new emphases. And among the unfinished business is perhaps a research program, maybe an effort to address the two problems that have been mentioned but that have never really been addressed: the relationship among libraries and academic administrations, and the relationships among libraries, particularly on a national basis. Thank you.

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Page. I find it a little unnerving to be quoted from ten years ago!

MS. ACKERMAN: That is the way it is!

MR. WEBSTER: Yes! I hope the annual reports are all that consistent. The reports have been produced over a period of years and attempt to reflect not only on what we are trying to do but also our general strategy. There has been a considerable effort invested both in being descriptive and in indicating to the Membership the directions we are taking.

Our next speaker is Dr. Irene Hoadley, Director of the Texas A&M University Library. Irene is presently a member of the ARL Board of Directors and this year is also Member-at-Large on the ARL Executive Committee, as well as chairman of the OMS Advisory Committee. She will review, briefly, the evolution and current financial circumstances of the Office.

MS. HOADLEY (Texas A&M University): Thank you, Duane. Let me start off with just a little bit of background. As Page pointed out, OMS began in 1970 with a very small staff — Duane and one secretary — and a very small budget of about $40,000, all of which came from the Council on Library Resources. Over the ten-year period of the Office's existence, support has grown to a budget of about $475,000 for 1980-81.

Most of the support over the ten years of OMS's existence has come from sources outside of ARL. Direct ARL contributions to the Office began in 1974-75, with about $5,000, and have grown in the last six years to a level of $55,000 per year. Over this period of time, support has averaged about $30,000 from ARL. Beyond the actual dollars of support that the ARL has provided to OMS, the Association has also contributed in additional ways, with such things as fiscal control for the Office, guidance and assistance from the ARL staff and the Membership, in terms of the advisory committee and its predecessors. I have not made any attempt to put a dollar amount on these because one cannot accurately do so with those kinds of services. The other support for the Office has come from a variety of sources. The Council on Library Resources, over the ten years, has provided about $890,000; the Lilly Endowment has provided $140,000 over a three-year period; the Mellon Foundation provided $500,000 over an eight-year period; the National Endowment for Humanities has provided $150,000 over a two-year period. Thus, we are talking about considerable levels of support.

The third category of support for OMS is from service-generating or cost-recovery activities. For the last three years, this has averaged about $100,000 per year for the Office. Because most of the support for OMS has been from funding agencies and not the parent organization, priorities for OMS have sometimes had to correspond to the priorities of the funding agencies, i.e., gearing projects to the funds available. Some grants have provided general support for OMS, allowing

the Office to determine the priorities. For example, the early support from the Council was of this nature. In some cases, OMS has been able to obtain funding to address a priority of ARL, such as the preservation project presently under way. But in some cases, it has been necessary to obtain grants for activities that were, in a sense, peripheral to ARL interests, just to have funding to maintain the Office at its present level. An example of this is the Small Library Planning Program funded by the Lilly Endowment.

Overhead from these projects has contributed some relevant services. But as a result of this situation, OMS was beginning to move away from its original goal. The primary goal, as Page pointed out, was to serve the interests of the ARL members, but for financial reasons, there was some movement away from that goal, and the OMS was in a position of pursuing some grants of peripheral importance to the ARL Membership in order to get funds to maintain a sufficient level of staff for the full range of activities which it offers. The OMS Advisory Committee spent the past year trying to resolve this issue, trying to find a way to minimize OMS involvement in these peripheral but economically vital projects. As a result, OMS, during the past year, moved to program budgeting, in order to get a clearer picture of its operations. A five-year projection of OMS finances indicates a fairly firm budget through 1982-83. But beginning in 1983-84, the budget is more speculative, based on projected projects and activities.

In January 1981, the Board approved a set of priorities for OMS, and part of that action included an increased commitment from ARL to the OMS Office. It was the recommendation of the OMS Advisory Committee that the level of support be doubled from the current level of 12 percent. The committee would like to build a very solid financial base centered around ARL support, thus allowing OMS to maintain an emphasis on ARL library needs. What would be the impact of this increased support? First, it would assure continuity of the programs, and, it is hoped, would contribute to controlling increases in costs to members. It should also provide continuing funds for the developmental work going on within the Office. OMS operations would continue on a cost-recovery basis, and it would not be necessary for OMS to seek projects for the sake of funding. OMS would then seek grants directed towards the expressed needs and interests of the Membership.

I think we also need to consider the alternatives for OMS if ARL support is not increased. OMS can go along in its current mode of attaining grants wherever money is available, even if these things may be of peripheral interest to ARL members. It is also likely that it would be necessary to reduce the level of activity. Some current OMS programs would have to be discontinued. Another alternative would be to charge more for the existing services, and institute charges for some of those services which are now provided at no cost.

One other point I wanted to make, since we are talking about money, is that OMS has made a conscious effort at cost reductions in the existing operations. I think you all know what has happened to travel costs and, if you have been involved in OMS activity within the past year, you know that the staff have tried to combine trips and otherwise economize. They have also examined their office operations and have been able, by redefining some of their activities, to make some cuts.

OMS is right now at a juncture in its development. It can move forward into some new activities while maintaining the current level of operations, or it can

become an essentially stable operation, relying solely on the current programs, using grant opportunities to determine any new development. OMS has contributed, at least indirectly, to activities within every ARL library, and we hope that the financial base for the future will provide even more benefits for all of the members. Thank you.

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Irene. The last person with a formal assignment this morning is Louis Martin, Director of Libraries at Cornell University. Lou was the Associate Executive Director at ARL when the OMS was created. He has worked in several research libraries, and with his varied background and experience, is well qualified to talk about the direction we should be taking.

MR. MARTIN (Cornell University): I am not really here to tell you where we ought to be going, but to implore the Membership to help tell the advisory committee and the staff of OMS how we can best respond to their needs during this very interesting time. Page Ackerman quite accurately characterized the beginnings of the OMS. As Steve McCarthy and I happened to be there at the beginning and, although we were not the primary movers in the establishment of it, the trip down Memory Lane was rather interesting. I suppose, with all of the skepticism with which I viewed the introduction of management into the ivy offices of the ARL — and I did have a good deal of skepticism about the Booz, Allen and Hamilton/Columbia study and the whole role of management, the jargon of which I did not understand — it is only fitting that I am still on the advisory committee, being asked to help, as best I can, the OMS to continue its very important work. And I am here today to ask for your help in determining the OMS agenda for the '80s in a way that is truly responsive to the needs of the research library community.

The question is relatively simple to ask; arriving at the answer is much more difficult. Basically, we want to know what the Membership needs from the OMS over the next few years, if we are to cope somehow — and I avoid the word "manage" — in this particular decade. Both Page and Irene have pointed out that we have grown, as most organizations do, circumstantially. We have seized the moment — meaning dollars now — to stay alive. We tried to do what was possible as well as we could, while inching toward an up-to-date and coherent program of assistance to the research library community.

But, the time for inching is gone. We would like to take a leap even greater than those that have been taken over the last five or six years to really attack the problems of the research library community. Page and I, for example, did not compare notes before this meeting, but I was struck by the fact that she alluded to the old agenda of "research and development" as being one of the original thoughts in the Booz, Allen and Hamilton study and as being important for the research library community to undertake. In my notes, I had written, "Are there new or old capabilities that we should develop?" The first one is "research," with a very large question mark. The advisory committee, the Board of Directors, and the OMS staff can only go only so far in determining the general answers to the directions of the Office of Management Studies. That there will be future directions and a future important role for the OMS, even greater than what it has been in the past, is, to my mind, unassailable — and that is saying a good deal. I would not have said that some time ago. It is determining the agenda that is extremely important if Duane Webster, the staff that has been developed, the advisory committee, and the Board

are to proceed with some confidence. This is what we hope the "town meeting" aspect of this program will elicit.

The advisory committee has an important role to play, and we do not shirk that. We are, to the degree we can be, there to ensure that the Office of Management Studies is well-managed, and besides reviewing the budget, we are there to be able to tell the OMS that this particular project is or is not in the best interests of the large number of people, whether or not there are trade-offs.

I will sit down, in the interest of turning this over to the Membership, where this part of the program belongs, after concluding with one final note. Where is the real impact of the OMS over the last ten or eleven years? From my singular and biased point of view, I believe that the OMS has created an awareness of what we can do by developing management skills within the research libraries and, to some extent, within the larger academic community, because I do feel that the work of the OMS on individual campuses has had a ripple effect throughout those campuses and has had some impact on what Hank Edelman says is our real job: the training and education of university administrators. In a relatively brief period of time, OMS has turned out, through its various programs, a good-sized cadre of trained and stimulated men and women who, ultimately, are going to be the answers to the problems we face in the '80s. That is the essential ingredient of any management program — to turn out skilled, dedicated people who are both good managers and good leaders. But, the OMS Advisory Committee needs the input of the Membership, and one very important question is how best to go about structuring those mechanisms of communication that will insure the kind of input which will make the work of the Board, the advisory committee and, utlimately, the OMS as effective as it can be in meeting the needs of this audience.

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Lou. I am also going to ask the other members of the advisory committee to be available for comments and reactions to any questions you might have. They include Frank Grisham, Frank Rogers, and Martin Runkle. Now, I would like to open the floor to any comments, questions, or perspectives you would like to share.

MR. ANTHONY (Syracuse University): Ten years ago, I was involved in the study at the Columbia University. As Page pointed out, it became clear to us, early in our deliberations, that the effort being made at Columbia was not going to provide a philosophers' stone that would be readily applicable to other institutions. Thus, the development of the Office of Management Studies, which, I believe, has performed well. In partial answer to one of the questions that has been raised is the fact that we must identify the individual problems that exist on various campuses, recognizing certain variations and variables, and address these problems accordingly. This is a step that must be continued and, I would agree, another view or review of the mechanisms needed to do this more effectively and efficiently has to be developed.

MR. WEBSTER: I am not sure that requires a response. I would like to mention that the notion of self-study strategy is, in fact, tailored to be institution-specific, to allow a particular library to define the issues it wants to address, as well as the outcomes that it is seeking. It is not an attempt to force on libraries a Columbia model or any other model of organization staffing.

MR. MARTIN: Questions from John McDonald and Ray Frantz this morning raised the issue of programmatic development within the university as it impacts the university library, and how the library is not in a position, many times, to influence that development. From what Neil Rudenstine said, I would assume that Princeton is somewhat better off than other institutions in terms of an administrative procedure for program review. At the institution in which I work, it seems that programmatic decisions are made at the assistant instructor level and never even get to the central administration — and I do not think I really overstate that case too much! The central administration of the universities in which I have worked tend to be sympathetic toward this problem and wholly unable to do anything about it. I just wonder whether, since it is essential and central to the problems we all face, OMS might do a bit of research — I do not even know what it would look like or anything else — into what I believe is an essential question within academe. Or is this overstepping the bounds of OMS?

MS. ACKERMAN: The paper on research libraries from the Association of American Universities Research Universities Project is very encouraging, but it seems to me that to address the concern you have raised we must look at joint efforts. To answer your question, I do not think OMS, by itself, has an appropriate role in library relationships vis-à-vis the administration. However it might have such a role as part of a joint effort. The pressures on academic administrators that we heard about this morning may be great enough, perhaps, to offer at least an opportunity to consider such an effort.

MR. PINGS (Wayne State University): I want to disagree with Page. In the beginning, the OMS concentrated on situations from the top down, i.e., how we are managing. The problem I see here is how do we manage and support units within an environment — that is, not just within our own institution, but almost planet-wide? If we had some good management techniques that worked internally, they ought to be tested externally, because if we are going to have to deal with cutting back serials, changing services, accommodating to technology — whether it is a copying machine or whatever — this takes management. This means that the people for whom we are managing those facilities must participate and make the value judgments. It seems to me that is one of the things OMS did promote and was getting the information through a kind of parity arrangement.

Now, how do you get the faculty involved in these kinds of things, or the university as an institution? That is "management." Perhaps it also takes some leadership, but where does the leadership receive input? I do not see the management of a library as separate from the rest of the university.

MS. STONE (Catholic University): I am here as a guest, and perhaps I should not be speaking, but I just wanted to say that, as a pioneer for management improvement some twenty years ago, I think that some of the members of this Association do not realize the impact that OMS has had on the nonmembers of your group, which I have found as I have made contacts throughout the country. This ripple effect, when the history of this period is written, will show that OMS has had a major impact on the improvement of library management, to the great credit of Duane Webster, with whom I have had the good fortune of working over the years.

MR. McDONALD (University of Connecticut): Betty Stone's remarks prompt me to say that it seems to me that, as I was there at the creation — I was on that

ARL/ACE committee, and have always taken a kind of fatherly interest in Duane — I should like to see OMS continue to prosper. One of the important functions of the OMS, I believe, should be a kind of consciousness-raising. If you can make a manager out of Lou Martin — or any of us — that shows you are doing a job!

Now that I am involved with this PETREL project, I guess my thoughts are running more toward professional education and training, and I am wondering whether this consciousness-raising that you are so good at, Duane, might be more directly applied to the library schools in this new climate. As Betty said, there has been a considerable ripple effect already. I would like to see that accelerated, and I think that the interest that has now been generated by PETREL might provide the opportunity for doing that. As I study your documents, I do not see any direct or specific reference to this sort of thing. It may be something that you and your advisory committee and the Board might wish to consider more directly.

MR. WEBSTER: I think that is a good point. Of course, we have talked a little bit about some of the issues involved, and there certainly are opportunities.

MR. FRANTZ (University of Virginia): This is a very small point, but I wonder, as you enter the next ten years, if you might want to consider changing the name of your Office. I believe "management" is too restrictive; to me it implies "minding the store well," and I believe, from what has been said this morning, that we will have to get into more imaginative areas. If we keep using the word "management," it might imply a restriction in our thinking and opportunities. For example, you might want to consider, as a financial crunch is on us, what is a reasonable inconvenience our faculties ought to experience to save money. Words mean a lot and terms mean a lot, and might be that this is not the best term for your Office.

MR. WEBSTER: There has been, over the years, a fair amount of discussion over what we should be called. We have tried to make it brief, with "OMS." It is a topic that has been brought up in the advisory committee, at several points, as to whether the term "studies" is an appropriate term for the Office, or whether it should be "services"; whether we are talking about institutional development, rather than management; whether we are looking at more of a research/institutional-support capability than management training. Other comments?

MR. WATERS (National Agricultural Library): Looking at the first page of the Position Paper [see p. 94], I was particularly interested in assumptions three and four, and I wondered if you could elaborate on them briefly. These are the assumptions that you will be concerned with interinstitutional cooperation and that you will be using a prescriptive approach to projects undertaken.

MR. WEBSTER: I would be glad to respond, and perhaps the committee will help me on these points, too. The approach that we have taken from the outset is to provide direct assistance to institutions in strengthening their own internal capabilities, whether it is through additional information, through study techniques, or through training and preparation of their staffs. We have not, to this point, focused on or particularly emphasized bringing institutions together to solve cooperative or interinstitutional problems. The Association is very well equipped for examination of those issues which are joint problems, etc. Our attempt is to focus principally on the resources member libraries need to strengthen their own

internal capabilities. The committee has encouraged us to expand that horizon and to talk about not only collections, developing collection management within an institution, and strengthening our understanding of how we allocate and collect items and how to organize a staff to manage that operation, but also to look very carefully at how we can strengthen the decision-making processes that affect several institutions, and can serve to strengthen resource-sharing, for example, among a group of libraries. We do not have a specific strategy in mind, but the notion here is that perhaps the best help we can provide is to look at the decision-making/governance mechanism on an institution-to-institution basis.

Concerning the prescriptive approach to projects and services, there has been a sense, in the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center particularly, that the Office has emphasized solely a descriptive approach; that, even though we have been selective in the documents and materials that we include in that information clearing-house, our orientation is simply to reflect the current state of the art in a descriptive fashion, rather than to attempt to be prescriptive by saying, "This is how you should be making decisions in specific areas." Instead, we have tried to be descriptive on how an activity or service is approached in a variety of different libraries, with the hope that that can be used in an idea-generating, problem-solving, organizational-improvement fashion.

We believe that there are some areas — and I think Ray Frantz was touching on those earlier — in which the Office could be quite helpful by having more definitive data on what should be done about some of these problems rather than simply describing the variety of approaches being taken in various institutions; to become more specific in what individual libraries should be doing with performance appraisal, with staff classifications, with preservation problems, with complex management concerns, etc. There is a sense, on the part of the advisory committee — and they can comment on that if they would like — that there is a need to be something more than simply descriptive, and that we should also be evaluative and make some judgments about what is good about these current practices. If you have noticed the specific flyers and kits over the last year, there has been some movement toward being somewhat more than simply descriptive in a general fashion, particularly in the last two preservation flyers and kits, as well as the last two kits on services.

MR. ESPLIN (University of Toronto): It is very clear from today's program and from what we hear all the time that we are faced, in the coming decade at least, with the management of increasingly scarce resources, and that will lead us even further into the management of cooperation between our institutions and other institutions, and the management of the whole nation's management and coordination. I would suggest that this is the field where, going back to the original report reemphasized by Page Ackerman and Lou Martin, there possibly would be some useful research afield.

MR. WEBSTER: I would like to reiterate again that the character and philosophy of OMS is attempting to be reflective of what you want and are able to use in terms of organizational development within your own libraries. The Office continues to seek your comments and reactions. We can use them, through direct comments to Office staff, or through the well-established governance mechanisms of the Association.

THE IMPACT OF THE HEA TITLE II-C PROGRAM: THREE YEARS EXPERIENCE AND FUTURE PLANS

Dick W. Hays
Department of Education

MR. LUCKER: This morning's program is in two parts, covering the Title II-C program and the Association of American Universities' report on research libraries. The entire session will be chaired by Carlton Rochell. Because of a death in the family, Jim Haas was unable to be with us, and will not be on the program.

MR. ROCHELL (New York University): Jay, good morning. The first part of the program is on "The Impact of the HEA Title II-C Program": Three Years Experience and Future Plans." Our speaker is Dick Hays, who is currently Acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, in addition to his duties as a Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies, in the Department of Education. Dick holds a Master's degree in Public Administration and Political Science from the University of California at Los Angeles. He has served in a variety of positions with the government over the years, and he has taught at the University of Redlands, Michigan State, and Bakersfield Community College.

Following Mr. Hays' remarks, a reactor panel consisting of Patricia Battin, Vice President and University Librarian at Columbia University, Kenneth G. Peterson, Dean of Library Affairs at Southern Illinois University, and Arnold Goren, Vice-Chancellor at New York University, will respond. There will then be an opportunity for questions and discussions from the audience.

MR. HAYS: Thank you, Carlton. I am delighted to be here. I was promised that the respondents are very kind early in the morning and I have looked forward to that, and also that most of the members of the audience would be sitting by people who had received grants so we would have everything under control when the question period came!

As Carlton indicated, I am one of the "utility infielders" in the federal government, and have played that role for a number of years. Currently we are going through a great deal of transition. In fact, at this point the only appointed and confirmed member of the new administration in the Department of Education is the Secretary. Other administrators have been designated and are now at the Department; the April 27 ARL Newsletter reported on the new Assistant Secretary-designate for Educational Research and Improvement.

These are busy and interesting days. Let me just quickly report on a number of items, particularly an update on the revision of the regulations for Title II-C of the Higher Education Act (HEA) currently under way. First, a brief general history of the federal investment in libraries. We can actually go back to the Morrill Act of 1862 — that is really when the Federal Government started making its investment in higher education. And, of course, the Federal Government has had a standing commitment to supplying its own library services through the Library of Congress and some of the fine departmental libraries. But it was not until 1956 that the Federal Government provided direct support to any type of library system in the

United States. The program was called the Library Services Act, which later became the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA). LSCA provides support primarily for public libraries, and was at first intended only to extend and improve services to people in rural areas. In the 1960s, the great days of the Great Society, school libraries were included as a supportable item in the federal budget, and the Higher Education Act was passed to provide support for college and university libraries, training, education, and research and demonstration projects. In 1976, HEA's II-C program, "Strengthening Research Library Resources," was added.

I will not get into the political aspects of II-C and how it came to be funded at that time — some of you probably know that history better than I. But the fundamental rationale behind II-C was to provide support for the well-being of research and scholarship in this nation and that the research libraries are the essential ingredient in that support; the major research libraries are the muscle of our research direction, and it would be in the national interest to make sure that these fine institutions are maintained. Additionally, the activities and resulting impact of these institutions cross state lines — certainly, it was beyond state and local responsibility. Thus, a law was written and passed.

The program started with a lot of high hopes, as all legislation does, and I think a lot of expectations were created. For example, the program was authorized at $10 million, and the law stated that up to 150 grants would be awarded annually. But reality set in shortly after that, and the first appropriation was at a lesser level — appropriations usually are — about $5 million. We are now at an appropriations level of $6 million after several years. We have had many requests for support, but we are able to fund only a portion of the proposals that are submitted.

I would like to take a look at the first three years of the program, and comment briefly on some of the policies that have guided it. The first critical policy decision was that there would be very few awards. It was actively debated within the Office of Education and in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the decision made — at a higher level than the Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies -- that there would be very few awards given. In fact, the discussion started at six grants, then escalated to 12, before finally deciding to award 20 grants. The rationale behind that number was that the awards to be given were to be significant enough to complete a job, and that the II-C program was not to become another Higher Education Act Title II-A; the money appropriated under that Title is divided among the total number of institutions that apply — everybody receives a small grant. I think the logic of providing a significant amount of money is fairly sound but it is highly debatable among any group as to how few grants should be provided. Then, of course, these grants would be given for one year or two years, and as we had a number of multiple-year awards, it meant that only eight new projects were funded last year.

What has II-C accomplished through the years? It is hard to measure, but let me give you some dazzling statistical information. To date, $17 million has been spent and we anticipate in another month or so another $6 million will be spent, bringing the total through 1981 to $23 million for 68 grants. In terms of the areas covered, $3.5 million, or 21 percent of the money, has gone for preservation projects; $11.2 million, or 66 percent of the money, has gone for bibliographical control and access; and $2.3 million, or 12 percent, has gone for collection development.

In the area of preservation, the $3.5 million has been invested to support preservation projects at 12 separate research libraries. I say "invested," because this money has done more than preserve and restore valuable, deteriorating materials. Program funds have trained library staffs and provided greatly-needed equipment, so that preservation activities can become an integral part of the library operations. The II-C program has provided support so that expertise, improved skills, and new technology related to preservation would be available to the total research community. An example is at the Huntington Library, where money has been provided to update and equip a preservation laboratory, to train a new person, to assist in a number of areas, including the bindery and manuscript preservation, and to update the photographic lab — in fact to not only update but to advance the state of the art of how photography can be used, particularly for medieval manuscripts, to generally support unique collections which, after they are photographed, can be shared with other users.

As I noted, over half the II-C funds have been in the area of bibliographic control, and they have supported programs that have created machine readable records for a large number of monographs and serials. It came as a pleasant surprise to learn that the first item input into OCLC using AACR 2 was a II-C item. For the benefit of trivia collectors, I will report that the momentous occasion occurred at the American Museum of Natural History; the book cataloged was a collection of writings from New Guinea. I thought that would excite you! The first runner-up was a Tammy Wynette album. A variety of materials have been involved in II-C-sponsored bibliographic control projects, such as the University of California's project to develop a unique indexing system related to memorabilia, scripts, letters, and journals.

In terms of collection development, Cornell's Asian collection has been strengthened by the addition of 1000 serials, 500 foreign dissertations, and the cataloging of a backlog of 4000 Vietnamese titles. The University of Chicago's Middle Eastern collection provided a new challenge last year when they indicated that they wanted to go into Iran and get more material on the revolutionary period under the Ayatollah. Well, that came at about the same time as a State Department directive saying, "There will be no American citizen, no American money going into Iran, in any way." The proposal was one of the highest-ranking, so we had to deal with institutions that we do not normally deal with, such as the Office of the President, the State Department, etc. Finally, through the good nature of the University of Chicago and perseverance of the OLLT staff, we were successful — and Chicago is still staying within those 4,000 pages of guidelines and restrictions!

Let me just mention some of the ideas we are keeping in mind for the future of II-C in terms of current trends in the federal government. We should anticipate that we will be getting much harder questions on the federal role, i.e.: why is this program necessary? How long should it endure? What good does it do? What is the evidence that you really contributed to the benefit of the nation? I anticipate that these questions will be coming more and more for all of our programs during budget discussions this year, and I speak in relative not in absolute terms. The II-C budget and its support by this administration were truly outstanding. There are very few programs in the Department of Education that were not cut significantly. Overall, the library budget did well, and the II-C budget did very well; the President's proposal for 1982 funds remaining at the previous level, against today's conditions, is a most positive sign. It is hard to think about increases in the future, but right now,

I believe that we will survive 1982 quite well. We are now, however, gearing up for 1983. The planning process is under way, and we will be going through that horrendous decision-making process all over again, and the hard questions will be coming even more frequently.

There are many areas we need to look at regarding change and improvement for II-C; we cannot be complacent about this program. One of the questions relates to priorities: how shall we make those investments, and in what areas? The Department of Education cannot assign priorities that are not in the law, even though that might be desirable; the law is not flexible on that point. But within the context of the law, we must take a look at priorities as a community and as a profession — the Association of Research Libraries has a definite role in this area. What do you suggest as priorities, in what areas should the government invest, and how can the II-C program contribute? If there is to be any change in priorities, if there is to be any sense of focus, it is going to be by peer pressure from the associations, the library community, and research community. There is a vital role for the ARL to play, and your guidance would be greatly appreciated.

Another area which is of concern to us is dissemination and accountability — accountability not in the sense of "to the federal government" or "to the Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies," but accountability to the research library community. As you know, II-C grants give the recipient a great license to do good things, and a great license, if they wish, not to be very accountable. We are very fortunate that the recipients of our grants do feel accountable, but we must find a way to get information about this program out to a wider audience.

We have been too quiet about our programs. It is very difficult for a federal official to engage in public relations for the program. This year, however, we initiated a small dissemination effort. Those of you who received grants also received a small amount of money to publicize the results of your project. After all, the ears of Congress and other people are more alert to what the people in the community believe is important. One early example of the new dissemination effort is the brochure from Columbia describing their grant; it is an outstanding brochure, and represents the quality of the dissemination we need and want. A number of the other recipients, too, have started to spread the word. But, the projects of II-C are what is considered in the trade "well-hidden secrets." We must correct this, and we want to find some ways for ARL and the Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies to work together in this effort.

A third area of concern is the review process. A critical part of the decision-making for II-C awards is the peer review panel. As I have told the panels when they have come to Washington, this is the decision-making process; very rarely would we overrule the guidance from that panel. But we have problems in appointing panels. For example, conflicts of interest. The best people to serve on a panel are the people who have sent in the proposals! We do not have a large universe to tap for our panels, but we are working on ways to improve the process. The other problem we have is a high turndown to our invitations to serve on the panels. But, whether the II-C program works well is dependent upon the quality of people we have on the review panels. So, your comments and suggestions on how we can recruit good panels is crucial, because this program is going to be determined by the expertise and thinking of that panel — I cannot overemphasize this fact.

We are now at the point when ARL participation in the regulations process is very timely. As you know, the reauthorization for the II-C program took place a year ago. We have developed, if you will pardon the bureaucratic rhetoric, something called an "interim/final regulation" to operate under this year, which will expire in September. At this time, we are in the process of taking a very thorough look at the regulations, and we need your assistance in examining them.

Now, there are some ground rules. The President has given us some fairly firm guidelines. Regulations will not be prescriptive; they will follow the statute. And, with those two things in mind, regulations cannot be used to rewrite the law. There are several points to consider in making awards. There is a heavy emphasis in the scoring system on the strength of the institution relative to the quality of the proposal or project. When the scores for the institution and the proposal are added together, some libraries have an advantage because of their institutional score, regardless of project. This year, there has been a small change in the points, with slightly more emphasis on the quality of the project than the institution. However, we must still address the question of whether we should continue the point system as it exists, or modify how grants are awarded. There is no question that this is a program for major research libraries. But, it might be possible to have a two-phased process: first, a threshold definition would determine whether an institution meets the criteria of "a major research library," and then a panel would review the credentials of the proposal. The threshold would be strictly a "yes or no" decision, and once the threshold is reached, those eligible would then be reviewed solely on the merit of the project; that is where the quantitative score would be made. This is only one idea, and the Department would like your opinions and suggestions on this process.

The other area we are considering in particular is the geographical distribution of grants required by the legislation. For the past three years, we have operated with a formula which is triggered if any region — the country is divided into 14 regions for the purposes of this program — does not have a library that scores high enough for an award. Well, those of us who have worked with this find that applying a formula in this process is an arcane experience, to say the least. It looks good and some believe the process meets all the measures of quantitative judgment, but I have serious reservations about it. The law now states that the Secretary has more discretionary authority on how the geographic distribution is to be accomplished. Shall we use a formula, or shall we rely on the judgment of the Department and perhaps a review panel to make sure that there is reasonable geographical distribution? Can you substitute a formula for some reasoned judgment in that area? I do not know. This is another critical area where your thinking is needed.

So, where do we go from here? Past funding has been stable, and we believe that, with good support for II-C, the future there is fairly bright. But, as I said before, we cannot be complacent, and we cannot keep the products and the merits of our projects a well-kept secret. The program needs your full support, collectively and individually. This is a program that belongs to all of us. You are the experienced people in this area, and we need your frank and honest appraisal of the program continually — not once a year, not every three years. We need to be thinking together about a clear sense of future direction. All of us have experienced some disappointment and disillusionments, but this program is vital to the research libraries of our nation. I can pledge you our full support in continuing to try to do a good job, and look for your support. Thank you very much.

MR. ROCHELL: The first reactor this morning will be Patricia Battin, Vice President and University Librarian at Columbia University. Pat holds a Master's degree from Syracuse University; she is very active in the profession, currently serving as a member of the Board of Consultants for the National Endowment for the Humanities, chairman of the Program and Operations Committee of the Research Libraries Group, a member of the New York State Commissioner of Education's Committee on Library Development, and on advisory committees with the American Council of Learned Societies and the Council on Library Resources.

MS. BATTIN (Columbia University): First of all, I just wanted to say that next year in our Title II-C application, I am going to get together with Mayor Koch and ask for some money for the subway system in New York, because that's "access."

I am going to be controversial this morning, I hope, and I would like to get some things out on the table before I begin. I will call myself the names, and you will not have to do that!

First of all, I believe that one of the great strengths of this law has been the fact that it accepts the principle of national responsibility for our research libraries. There is embodied in this legislation probably the first recognition that we are not necessarily local and regional strengths only, but that we are part of the "national research library."

The second issue, then, is the one of "elitism," and I would define that as being a "commitment to excellence," and I would hope we are all "elitists" in that respect. And I believe that commitment to excellence knows no geographic boundaries. So, what I am going to talk about today is a basic conflict in the law; the requirement for regional distribution. This is an acceptable concept for programs of developing and building collections, such as the earlier Title II-C, the shared cataloging program. The revised Title II-C is to help libraries maintain collections that are in substantial demand by researchers and scholars not connected with that institution. I believe that the "regional balance" condition of the legislation is in direct contradiction to the basic criteria for qualification for assistance, because our libraries are not equally distributed geographically.

In this country we have a configuration that is somewhat different than other countries; we have a strong, centralized national library — the Library of Congress — and an equally strong decentralized system of national branch libraries spread across the country. This decentralization, too, in many ways, adds to the strength and diversity of our collections, but it can also obscure the perception that these research resources are part of the national collection and are essential to the support of scholarship and research across the country. And so when we consider legislation which has as its objective strengthening and maintaining resources, it seems to me that it is not only irrelevant but counterproductive to our objectives to consider geographical location as a factor in providing that support. It would be nonsensical to decide that we must constrain the Library of Congress budget because all that money stays in Washington. Why is it not equally nonsensical to insist on geographical distribution of federal funds to the "branches"? I did a little exercise for myself to take a look at the distribution. You probably think I am

speaking from great self-interest. To my surprise, I found other areas are worse than New York. ARL members range from three in a region to two regions having 14 each. The breakdown is a follows: there are two regions with four ARL members, two with eleven, two with ten, two with nine, one with six, and one with three. In addition, as you all know, there are a number of independent research libraries, most of which are located in areas already heavily populated with ARL libraries, so the inequality is even greater than it appears.

It seems to me a reasonable observation that the older and larger libraries will contain, as a rule, the unique, comprehensive collections which are cited as the objective of this legislation. These collections have been acquired, recorded, and preserved for periods of over two hundred years by both public and private institutions in the national interest. The regions in which these libraries are located have already borne heavy costs in supporting these libraries. Most of these libraries are in the most heavily populated areas of the country serving the greatest numbers of people. If we make an assumption that, in general, the older and larger libraries most nearly meet the criteria of the legislation and look at the top 30 libraries in the ARL Index, then the breakdown looks like this: zero in one region, one in one region, two in two regions, three in one region, four in two regions, five in two regions. If you take the top 50 libraries, there is one in one region, two in one region, four in two regions, five in two regions, six in one, seven in one, and eight in two.

Actually, one could argue that the regional balance condition results in double taxation for the library-rich regions; not only has local money, both private and public, supported these libraries for many years but, under Title II-C, appropriations derived from federal taxes levied on the region are being shifted, giving a heavy edge to those very regions which have provided the least support to libraries over the past two centuries. In other words, those regions which have been doing the least locally profit the most from the legislation.

It seems to me that it would be just as rational to provide points for population density, because one could say, "Okay, these will be more heavily used, if there are more people there." Or, points could be also awarded to institutions according to the number of years the institution has supported national library resources without compensation. Obviously, these criteria are nonsense, too. But I maintain that geographical distribution stands in the way of strengthening our libraries, and the only way we can meet our objectives — that the law can meet its objectives of strengthening and maintaining unique research resources — is to eliminate this requirement. And I would think if the library profession and, particularly, if ARL would urge our legislators to do that, in all our best interests, we would stand a pretty good chance of achieving that goal.

I would like just to speak briefly about one other area upon which I know people disagree, and I think it is complicated by the geographical distribution requirement, and that is the length of projects. I do not think I am alone in believing that one year is not a very long period of time in which to spend a considerable sum of money wisely, especially if you have to hire additional staff, etc. Many of the problems that we face in these older libraries require fairly complicated, two-, three-, or four-year projects. I am in favor of continuing multiple-year projects supported by this legislation. But, the problem is, then, in those areas such as New York State where in the past year there were three

projects and all were multiple-year projects, so there was no money for new projects because of the geographical constraint. So, again, we have a problem in making the most effective use of our money.

The experience of the last three years in making large awards to, possibly, a smaller number of institutions has been successful and also in keeping with the objectives of the legislation. In general, I believe local institutions do have the capacity to underwrite small projects. What we all lack are the large sums necessary for the substantial programs for preservation or to provide access to significant, unique collections, which might possibly have a low priority locally. One of the objectives of the federal assistance should be, it seems to me, to provide the capacity to support those activities which cannot be undertaken locally. So, I would very strongly urge that we not dissipate our resources across the country in small grants. It is much easier to raise that kind of money from other sources and depend upon the federal assistance to give us some really significant chunks to do the job that will benefit us all. Thank you.

MR. ROCHELL: Thank you, Pat. The second panelist is Kenneth Peterson, Dean of Library Affairs at Southern Illinois University. Ken has published widely, including a history of the library of the University of California at Berkeley, where he received his Doctorate in Librarianship; he is a member of a variety of associations, and also serves on the editorial board of the Journal of Academic Librarianship.

MR. PETERSON (Southern Illinois University): I confess to a degree of satisfaction in having been asked to participate in this program, but also to a sense of mixed feelings, when I was asked initially, because I believe I do represent a different point of view. In contrast to Pat, I would probably represent the great proletariat of the country, the middle level of ARL institutions that have been disappointed in not having received grants, although we are still strong supporters of the program and recognize the good that it has done. And I want to assure you, Mr. Hays, that you are among friends -- even those of us who have written you letters that have, perhaps, sounded nasty. We appreciate the program and appreciate the difficulties that you face in administering it.

Because I did not know what Mr. Hays or Pat would be saying, I prepared my remarks based upon the total range of things I wanted to say. Now, however, I find that my remarks, which were broken down into three sections, will be redundant. I was first going to talk about my perceptions of the background and reasons for II-C, but these have been covered, so I will not take the time to do that. Second, however, I do want to give some analysis of figures, which will be somewhat redundant with the figures Mr. Hays gave, though there will be a few places where there is a slight variance. (My calculations are based upon the reports issued by the Office of Education and reported in the press, and thus Mr. Hays may have more refinement in his figures than I have in mine.) And third, I have questions that I am asking, with recommendations. These questions represent some polling, on my part, of ARL directors with whom I have spoken about the Title II-C program, hoping that I would be able to use this opportunity better to represent the opinions of some of the proletariat rather than the elitists of the Association.

Let me, then, begin with the second part of my report, the statistical analysis. In fiscal year 1978, the first year of the program's operation, 101

applications were submitted totalling $27 million, and 20 grants were approved amounting to $5 million. In the second year, 87 applications were submitted totalling $25 million, and 26 grants were approved amounting to $6 million. Of the 26 grants in FY 1979, 16 were made to institutions that were recipients the previous year. In the third year, 71 applications were submitted totalling $17 million, and 22 grants were approved, amounting to $6 million. Of these 22 grants, 16 were made to institutions that were recipients the previous year, and 12 were made to institutions that were recipients the previous two years.

In summary, over the three-year period, 259 applications were submitted totalling $69 million, and 68 grants were approved amounting to $17 million. During the three-year period, funding was provided to 33 applicant institutions, with ten additional institutions included as program participants. (That is the figure that I have that varies with the figure that Mr. Hays gave, but I am sure that his figure is more accurate than mine.) Of the $17 million total expended, more than 50 percent of available Title II-C funds were awarded to nine applicant institutions, with five additional institutions as participants. A further breakdown shows that, in the course of three years, slightly over $2,400,000 was provided for one continuing program in which three institutions participated, and slightly over $1 million was provided to a single institution. These two continuing projects accounted for slightly over $3.5 million, or roughly 20 percent of the total Title II-C funds for the three-year period.

In reporting of grants each year, awards were listed under the three main activity groupings: collection development, preservation, and bibliographic control and access. Considering the three-year period, the allocation of funds shows a little over $11 million or roughly, 66 percent for bibliographic control and access projects; about $3.5 million dollars, or roughly 21 percent, for preservation projects; and $2,262,000, or roughly 13 percent, for collection development. Among the grant recipients over the three-year period, 25 were university libraries, two public libraries, two public research libraries, two independent research libraries, one state department of education, and one special research library.

Based upon the experience of three years operation, and in light of the original purpose and intentions of the program, several questions may be raised about Title II-C to date.

First, recognizing that there were approximately 200 institutions — and this was a figure given by one of the administrators in the Office of Education as the possible number of qualifying institutions — that fell within the Title II-C definitions and that the upper limit was set at 150 grants per year, has a sufficient number of grants been made? Awarding grants to only 33 applicant institutions over the course of three years appears far too restrictive, even though there were direct benefits to ten additional participant libraries, and indirect benefits to many other non-recipient libraries. This point is supported by the Senate Report on the Education Amendments of 1980 relative to Title II-C, in which the committee expressed the belief that "at least twice as many grants as are currently being made should be awarded."

Second, in view of the number of applications received each year, have there been too many long-term or renewal grants, which have limited a broader

distribution of funds? When the amounts awarded over the three-year period are reviewed, in comparison with the total funds available, the grants do not reflect sufficient equity in distribution. This point is also supported by the Senate Report on the Education Amendments in which the committee encouraged the Secretary to "take care to see that the same small number of institutions do not continue to receive grants year after year."

Third, while recognizing the values of both bibliographic control and access, as well as preservation, has the granting of only 13 percent of total funds specifically for collection development over the three-year period really fulfilled the intent of Title II-C to strengthen research library resources? Granted that duplication of purchases among research libraries is not the purpose of the program, more grants for the acquisition of unique collections and for the development of holdings in very specialized fields would have been appropriate. Greater attention should be given to the collection development aspect of this program, while still maintaining support for bibliographic control and access, as well as for preservation.

Fourth, recognizing that research libraries vary greatly in size as well as in strengths of their collections, was it not the intent of many of the original supporters of Title II-C that the program would provide significant support for those research libraries that are still developing, as well as those that have already attained preeminence? If this is true, then the allocation of 60 evaluation points based on the strength of the applicant institution and only 50 points on the strength of the proposal was disproportionate. Title II-C grants to many developing research libraries would provide a significant margin of difference in acquiring materials not affordable from institutional budgets, or in developing bibliographic controls and access for unique holdings in their collections, or in advancing preservation activities where progress has been already made and needs to be continued.

In conclusion, there is no question that Title II-C has strengthened research library resources during the first three years of its operation. It is time now, however, to set some new directions for the program that will distribute available resources to many more institutions and to a greater variety of collection development, bibliographic control, and preservation programs. In this way, the benefits of Title II-C will more evenly permeate the entire research library community of our nation. Thank you.

MR. ROCHELL: Thank you, Ken. Now, for a nonlibrarian view, the last reactor for this portion of the program is Arnold Goren, Vice Chancellor at New York University. Arnie has had a variety of experiences within NYU, having served as Dean of Admissions and as Director of Student Activities, and has more than thirty years of teaching experience in the School of Education. He has an MA Degree in Higher Education from NYU and, in May of last year, was awarded an Honorary Doctor of Letters from Mercy College. He is President of the City Club of New York and a member of a number of civic organizations in the city. He has written widely in the field of higher education, as well as being on the potato-salad circuit, rather regularly, and also deals primarily, at this point, with federal and state relations in the name of the University.

MR. GOREN (New York University): I suppose that there always should be one generalist who does not know much about a subject, and that is me in this case. From the point of view of a university administrator rather than that of a librarian,

there are some things that I would like to say about what you have heard today. Perhaps they will have some value for you — and perhaps not. If not, you have my apologies.

First, my attitude in general toward the libraries at New York University, where I have worked for 35 years, is a very simple one. When I ran the university — which I do not, these days — I soon found out that the library was everyone's second priority, and I determined that anything that was everyone's second priority should be the university's first priority. So it was my assumption that the first thing we had better do at New York University was to build a magnificent new library. Obviously, we were sidetracked. A man came in with a few million dollars for a student center; we took his money and built a student center. But, we had clearly in mind the importance of the library to the central core of the university. And, when we built our library, we gave the university its guts — you have to understand that previously our library was the bottom of the main building and students went on roller skates to get a book. My attitude toward the library is shaped both by my experience as a child and my knowledge of what a true university is without a library. There is no question about that.

Now, having said that, I would like to react to what I have heard here today by saying to you that some of it surprises me. Your defect is similar to the medical community debating the merits of this fine medical center or that modest place where a key senator on the committee sits. It is no debate at all; you will have to take care of the senator who sits on that committee. That does not mean you do not find the money for the fine medical center; the debate is joined incorrectly. You will have to do both, because if you do not do both, that Senator will kill you in a key committee. I happen to be an elitist. I believe in meritocracy, in doing it only for the good institution. But I will tell you now, there will be nothing done for the good institution, if you do not take care of the key Senator. And, that is as practical as I can get.

Let me tell you a small joke. There is a story of a young man who married a beautiful young wife. He was very suspicious of this wife, and arranged to come home early one day at three o'clock. As he walked in the front door in his apartment on the tenth floor in a high-rise in New York, he thought he saw the back door swing shut. He ran around the room looking for the other man, who was nowhere to be found. So, he went to the window and looked down ten stories. There he saw a young man putting on his coat, smoothing his hair, climbing into a Volkswagen. In a wink, he strode to the refrigerator, wrestled it through the window, and kicked it out of the window. The next morning three young men were in front of St. Peter. St. Peter said to the first, "How did you get here, young man?" The man said, "I was going to my new job, starting at four o'clock in the afternoon, from nowhere came the refrigerator, which crashed down on the car and me." St. Peter said to the second one, "How did you get here, young man?" The man said, "I don't know. I was lifting a refrigerator, and I had a heart attack and died." Then St. Peter said to the third young man, "And how did you get here, young man?" The man said, "I don't know. I was just sitting in this refrigerator, minding my own business..."

That story suggests two observations I would like to make on what we have heard today. First, as I mentioned, your arguments are not joined well. Your arguments must be joined with some degree of awareness of their political

consequences. I am sure the people here know that, and have their own reasons for taking more extreme positions. But, you do not want to be the guy in the refrigerator, the guy hit in the street, or the guy killed by throwing the referigerator, and you had better think about how you are going to come to some resolution of what I do not believe is a real problem. The resolution must be made, despite most of our beliefs that we should not have to deal with the issue in that fashion. We do have to deal with the issue in that fashion.

Second, let me say this. $6 million is a joke — a joke! The budget of my university is probably $467 million this year. And that is only one university. What I am saying to you is that you do not find allies very successfully for librarians, partly because, somehow or other, nothing has been put together that makes the impact clear to the people who should be your allies. Although you may have tried, it has not worked. Something is missing, based upon what I have heard. Now, for someone to say to you — and, incidentally, I hope this does not hurt our request for a grant this year, made jointly with Columbia and the New York Public Library — that "$6 million is okay, because we didn't get killed," it is as if to say that our slow death here is not quite as bad as the rapid demise of some of our very good friends! The opportunity for cannibalism is about to occur. Over the next few years, there will be "institutional cannibalism." It is an illusion that you have not been cut, because the rest of us have been cut — and when we start looking for places from which to get some of our hide back, we are going to go to the library, as we are going to go to the English department or to whatever department from which we can get a piece of the hide. Institutionally, we are getting killed in Washington, and you have all been cut whether you know it or not.

As far as II-C not having been cut, just consider the inflation rate and $6 million. Mr. Hays quite carefully said, "compared to others," and I do not wish to misrepresent what he did. He told the literal truth, and he told it, I believe, under very difficult circumstances. The man working in Washington is always between the rock and the hard place, and right now it is worse than ever. But, the fact is that $6 million is a cut; it is an inflationary cut and it is a cut in terms of what is going to happen to the rest of your institutions which will look for other kinds of help. And that, of course, cannot be addressed by the people from Washington. They have to deal with the facts of life. If they manage to save $6 million, it is a victory for that item. But it is no victory for libraries, and that is a significant difference which you should understand. If they save $6 million for a very good program, you are not in good shape — you are only not in quite as bad shape as if they had lost $4 million.

I do not wish to prolong what I could have to say because, as you see, I have made quite a few notes — pages of them — from this. But, I want to urge only that the argument is no different than the one in medicine or the other sciences. Look for allies. Do not think you have not been cut, and do not accept the idea that $6 million for II-C is a reasonable amount of money. I do not know how well you are going to do this year, given the cuts in Function 500, but I would tell you this: you should do a lot more screaming, look for more allies, and you should not continue, in my judgment, to engage in this debate because it does not work. You are going to need Southern Illinois and we are all going to need Columbia. And, believe me, if my name were Jake Garn in Utah, I would want to make sure you took care of the University of Utah as well. Our system is such that, when a guy comes in and says to me, "We are getting killed in the Pell Grant Program and the Guaranteed Student Loan Program, and here is our great opportunity to seek the public institutions in

the head, because they are going to ration it in ways so that only private, independent universities of great stature will survive, and we can sink them here," I will say, "My name is Congressman Zilch from Indiana and four blocks from me is a great public university." And, if you are coming to me, with that argument, I would say to you "that does not smack of reason."

I thank you for listening and having me here and I apologize if I have offended your superior knowledge of this field or your understanding of politics. Thank you.

MR. ROCHELL: Thank you, Arnie. That is a good note on which to end the reactions. You have heard Dick Hays ask for our thinking on criteria for awards, priorities, accountability, the peer panel review, and geographical distribution. Pat has argued from the elitist point of view for the program as it has been distributed and as it will be in the future, arguing against the provision of regional balance, and stating that it is a contradiction to the intent of the law. Ken Peterson has taken the opposite point of view, more or less, and Arnie Goren has asked them to kiss and make up ...

MR. GOREN: Or else!

MR. ROCHELL: ... in terms of the practical politics of the issue, and warning us that we should not feel in any way smug about a $6 million that will, effectively, be probably 40 percent less than that in three years or so and, also, the reality of what is going on in other places in higher education. We have laid before you some issues for consideration, and I would now like to entertain questions from the floor. You may direct your questions to either the speaker or the respondents.

MS. SCHNAITTER (Washington State University): I have a question for Mr. Hays. Is there a restriction, in deciding on the peer review panel, that says that panelists must be representatives of United States libraries?

MR. HAYS: I am not sure, but I would think so. You would have to have a very good reason why you would select a representative from a non-United States library.

MS. SCHNAITTER: Well, we have some fine peer libraries among our Canadian colleagues. That might be a way to get some objective views, if it were possible.

MR. HAYS: This is not an easy question to answer. I just wanted to share with you the dilemma of compiling good panels and to ask your support, particularly when you are asked to serve, because the peer panel is crucial to the quality of this program in making determinations on these various issues. The law does not permit deciding a lot of things. Thus, when you are asked to serve, please find every means to do so, because we need you. The quality of the peer panels and their power cannot be overemphasized. One of our speakers indicated that perhaps we should be making investments in 'X' instead of 'Y'. It is the decision of individual leaders that have an impact on such things, not the Department of Education.

I believe we have objectivity, as with contract readers. Even though Carlton Rochell may have submitted a project, it would be acceptable to have Carlton as a reader, as long as he does not touch anything dealing with his university. We think

the quality and caliber of people we have can handle such situations, though we have a battle each year convincing our contract officer that that will work. We believe it will — and that it has so far. Our problems come from the ad hoc system of trying to put together quality panels at the last minute. So again, I would urge you all, if you are asked — and, many of you will be as this is the universe that is tapped for review panels — do everything you can to serve.

MR. FORTH (Pennsylvania State University): I do not have a question so much as a comment. I was on the American Library Association Legislation Committee that originally proposed the Title II-C law; I believe James Schmidt was on it at the same time. At that time, we argued this very question of the wording of the law, and both ARL and ALA got into the act — that normally happens with a legislative committee or any committee that expects to be second-guessed. And this business of the quality of the library was included. I had become a member of that committee in the hopes that it would emphasize building collections. Obviously, that has not been its main thrust at all, and I think Ken Peterson alluded to this — Ken, it must be wonderful to have a degree in theology; it gives you a degree of gentleness and Christian charity that I, in a thousand years, could not handle. I am really very hostile to Title II-C, for reasons that should be obvious. For three years, I and two other universities have put in proposals that would be of national service to the country in the area of energy. Energy is a major concern of the United States government. Our three universities have more materials on coal resources, coal research, etc., than anybody else in the country. For three years, we have been turned down, with "the quality of your libraries is not of national importance." That gets very tiring. And, while your distinguished administrator from NYU put his finger — very intelligently and shrewdly, and not surprisingly — on the Senator from Utah, I represent the "Junior Senator," as it were, in ARL, from the State of Pennsylvania. I will defer to my senior colleague, Dick De Gennaro, who is not here.

I am not particularly supportive of Title II-C as it is presently administered, and I get very disturbed when the ARL leadership says, "Now, we are all for this, because it is going to benefit everybody through the old trickle-down theory." I find this very, very disturbing, and I am sharing my concerns with my university's lobbyist — we call him a representative rather than a lobbyist — in Washington. I think that the ARL leadership had really better listen to Ken Peterson and listen to Mr. Goren, and get this act in better order than it has been, at least if you want the support of people like me. How many land-grant institutions have received grants? I would be interested to know that. We are thinking of taking this issue to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, simply because we feel we are getting — to not put too fine a point on it — screwed. I would prefer not to do that, but I do think we need some response from you all.

MR. LUCKER: I am speaking for my own institution. I have a set of suggestions, rather than a question, that I have been considering.

First of all, I would suggest that the emphasis on the developed institutions has formed what I perceive as a bias against the scientific and technical collections of libraries, because many of the libraries that are strong in science and technology tend to have been formed considerably later in this country than those having strengths in the humanities and social sciences. I also propose that it is possible to solve both the concerns of elitist and of developing institutions by a combination of large and small grants — e.g., it would be helpful for the Office to establish some

sense that there would be some large grants for major projects but also a substantial number of smaller grants for worthy projects. Some balance between these two would satisfy some of the concerns of both of the groups of libraries represented in this room.

On the matter of panels, I would suggest that the Office look into the possibility of a system like the National Endowment for the Humanities. Instead of a group of panels independently looking at a series of proposals and putting together, inevitably, a different set of evaluations because they are not talking to each other, I suggest that the proposals be sent to a group of reviewers to be rated, and then that a single panel look at the total list of recommendations and make one set of judgments.

There is one other area where I feel concern, in which I consider myself somewhat of an amateur expert, and that is the field of overhead. One way to get more bang for your buck in this is by having a single set of rules regarding the application of overhead to these grants. At the moment, it is my understanding that each institution can either apply to have overhead included or have it not included, depending upon its institutional requirements. Again, if you will look at the National Endowment for the Humanities and National Science Foundation, with regard to academic libraries, there are no provisions for overhead, and they have still been able to find lots of customers. I would strongly recommend that the Department of Education not include overhead provisions. I believe that if library administrators go to their administration, saying, "We cannot get overhead," they will still be allowed to apply, but there would be a considerably greater amount of money available to the libraries by having all of the money going into the program used for library activities and not for personnel and student services.

MR. McDONALD (University of Connecticut): I certainly do not want to take a step backward here, after Jay's very great, statesmanlike statement, but it is so rare that I find myself in complete agreement with Stuart Forth that I have to get up and say so! It is not the first time in this meeting either, Stuart! I do not know which of Mr. Goren's three men I am — all I know is that I am dead! We have not even applied for a II-C grant; our reading of the guidelines persuaded us that that would be wasted motion.

I think Jay's suggestions are good. I would just like to say one serious thing, and that is that there are two aspects to the program, as I recall from reading the literature. One is the strengthening of research library resources — and, after all, ARL does embrace a lot of different libraries, not all of which are the same. They are research libraries, though perhaps not all in the Columbia sense. But it is not just a matter of strengthening resources. It is also a matter of sharing them and making them accessible, and I feel we ought to take a look at interlibrary loan statistics and see what libraries are doing what. For reasons that others may know better than I, some of the least-mature ARL libraries are doing a very large share of the interlibrary loan business, and it seems to me they deserve some recognition through this program for that contribution which they make. And I do think that it might behoove the operators of the program to take a look at this area and perhaps the program could recognize this contribution. I can give you a local example. The University of Connecticut is a large lender of material and yet it is not a large library, in the ARL sense. The last time I looked, I believe Connecticut was lending more material than Columbia.

MR. KREISSMAN (University of California, Davis): I am a little dismayed by the last speaker, in the sense that, if we followed his prescription completely, all questions of merit in regard to this discussion would evaporate, and we would be arguing it on political terms. I am very much aware of the politics involved here, and the nature of the original Act in regard to the political situation, and I accept what Professor Goren has said in this matter. But, I do want to address the issue of merit, somewhat apart from politics, recognizing that we cannot leave the politics aside. But, particularly to Pat, in relation to the argument, I would argue that a similar set of statistics and arguments could be adduced which would tend to exactly the opposite conclusion. If one wanted to raise these particular points ad hoc, one could immediately raise the invidious issue — which I would not want to rise, except in this situation — that you are arguing for the groups which have taken a stance of collecting without disseminating, and arguing that, now, dissemination is a responsibility of others rather than the institution that did the original collecting. One could also argue, if one wanted to push this situation, to the effect that, under your prescription, the rich would get richer, the haves would get haver, and the rest of us would take what we call, out in the West, the "hind tit" in this matter.

I would further argue that, if you follow your argument to its logical extreme, all of the proscriptions you are accepting may be looked at with a jaundiced eye, and that the single, most important criteria to be recognized in this is the national good of the proposal, and leave all the rest of it out.

MR. ROCHELL: I am going to give each speaker one minute to say whatever they might want to say, and that will end the first part of the session.

MR. HAYS: Thank you, Carlton. Mr. Goren, I am well aware of politics, too, but you have a greater license to talk than I do. In three or four years, the "real Dick Hays" will appear, and say what he really thinks. Meanwhile, I just wanted to say, I am delighted we have had the conversation. I do not want it to end here. I think it is nice to hear all these things. They are very important issues to really thrash out, and the Association should continue its deliberations. We have an exciting opportunity, exciting in the sense that we can make some significant changes. We cannot rewrite the law, but we can change the regulations and, to some degree, change operating procedures. Let us do it, but let us do it together. Let us thrash those arguments out here, and see what we can do, working together. I do not need to hear from you all individually. What I would like to hear is how ARL, as an institution, and how you feel, and what the options are, so we can work together. I am delighted that you have opened up the conversation today. It has been needed for some time, and after three years, it is a very healthy thing.

MS. BATTIN: I just wanted to say that I agree absolutely and completely with Bernie Kreissman. That is what I was trying to say, and did not make myself very clear. When I called myself an "elitist," I defined it as being a "commitment to excellence," which can be public, private, or quasi-anything. I would agree that the sole criterion should be the quality of the proposal and its contribution to the national good. In Ken's case, he has not received grants because he was told that his institution does not qualify in the first part of the criteria, though Southern Illinois got very good marks in the quality of the proposal. Columbia got very good marks in the quality of the proposal, but does not qualify because of geographical distribution. Southern Illinois is in the top 50 of the ARL Index and is also in one of the regions most heavily impacted, i.e., where there were 15 libraries in the top 50.

MR. PETERSON: Stuart, thank you for your very kind remark. I do not know that I have a corner on the market of grace, because of what I want to say! Southern Illinois University comes very close to being the median institution of ARL. If you will look at the ARL Statistics, we hover right in the upper 50/lower 50 group. Yet, in terms of being a net lender, we rank about twelfth or fourteenth. Our interlibrary lending, at this point, is close to 30,000 items per year, which is quite high. I believe that the point that John McDonald made about interlibrary lending is a very good one.

Second, we have submitted proposals in each of the last three years and, again, this fourth year. Last time, being quite dismayed, I asked for an evaluation, and went to Washington to meet with someone at the Office of Education (not Mr. Hays). I learned that, out of a total of 50 points on the quality of our project, we had received 47. I said, "Well, you know, I am concerned about this." And the respondent said, "Well, the program really is intended for the biggies — and, Mr. Peterson, your library is not one of the biggies." I am concerned about that. To me, it says something about all of ARL. There are large elitist institutions but there are also many middle level institutions where this program would make the margin of difference and where, as I think it was said by Bernie, the quality of the proposal, in terms of national interest, must be given serious consideration.

MR. GOREN: I am very lucky to get the last word. It is not usually so in administration. I would like to make three points.

One, you are "overhead," to somebody. Be careful of that procedure. In some universities, the way they calculate, you could be affected in the same way you are proposing to eliminate overhead. Two, I am for merit, and I want to use politics to protect merit, and I do not know any other way but to understand what the facts of life bring us. It is not sane to assume that, because you want to do something about institutions you consider meritorious, you can ignore the political facts of life. And, three, with apologies, I think you are between the rock and the hard place. It is true, you cannot speak the way I speak. But, that is the delightful ability to be irresponsible when you do not have the responsibility!

NINE RECOMMENDATIONS: A PROGRAM FOR NORTH AMERICAN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Barbara Turlington
Association of American Universities

MR. ROCHELL: This session is entitled: "Nine Recommendations: A Program for North American Research Libraries." The recommendations are from the Association of American Universities (AAU) Research Universities Project. The report of the project explores the future of research universities and makes recommendations for universities, federal government officials, and corporations for the solution of problems in a variety of areas. [A summary of the recommendations appears on p. 92-93.]

Our speaker, Barbara Turlington, is the Associate Director of the Research Universities Project and has been responsible for the research, writing, and editing of the report. Barbara holds a BA from the American University of Beirut. She has been Executive Assistant to the President of AAU, and has extensive teaching experience at Hampshire College, Mt. Holyoke College, and Connecticut College. While at Hampshire, she also held a number of university administrative assignments, including Acting Dean of the College, and served on accreditation and evaluation teams for the New England Association of Schools and Colleges and the Massachusetts State Board of Higher Education.

After Barbara's remarks, we will have a reactor panel including Margaret Child, Assistant Director of the Research Resources Program at the National Endowment for the Humanities, Ann Greenberg, Director of the Office of Sponsored Research at New York University, and David Esplin, Chairman of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. We will then have an opportunity for questions and comments from the audience.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce Barbara Turlington.

MS. TURLINGTON (Association of American Universities): Carlton has asked me to give a little background on the Research Universities Project. The project is a follow-up on the conversations that took place about five years ago, leading to publication of Research Universities and the National Interest. That book included a chapter written by Jim Haas, based on a draft by John McDonald, on "Research Libraries: Preserving the National Heritage." When Thomas Bartlett, President of the AAU, and the AAU Executive Committee discussed the possibility of doing an update on that set of papers, they focused on the need for new approaches to the increasing problems of research universities caused by inflation, government regulation, and some of the older problems that we had all been dealing with in providing adequate resources for the scholars and students. The focus of Research Universities and the National Interest was almost entirely on the federal/university partnership and what the federal government should be doing to help research universities fulfill their commitments to research and training. In the new project, part of the emphasis is on the question of where new partners are going to come from and where the universities can look for assistance to enable them to provide these services. Participants included 14 university presidents, the heads of the seven sponsoring foundations, and four corporate executives.

When I began working on the research libraries paper, I asked ARL to appoint an advisory committee to work with me. Over the summer, I met with Penny Abell, Dick De Gennaro, Dick Dougherty, Jay Lucker, and Rudy Rogers to lay out some of the priorities for research libraries. Each of them offered substantive suggestions and several offered particular language. They have all read several drafts of the paper, as have many of the rest of you. I am grateful for your comments, and hope I have responded to most of them in this draft of the paper. Jim Haas was also very helpful as were the ARL staff. My special thanks go to Carol Mandel, who helped me to clarify both the thinking and the language by struggling through several of my earlier drafts.

Robert Rosensweig, Vice President for Public Affairs at Stanford University, was appointed Director of the Project in April, 1980. We met with project participants in October at the AAU meeting to discuss drafts of the papers, and had another all-day session in December on revised drafts. The papers include a discussion of the general climate of policy-making and discussions of advanced graduate training, international and foreign area studies, research libraries, research facilities and instrumentation, and industry-university collaboration.

The responses from the participants, particularly the corporate participants, were, I think, illuminating in terms of where they wanted us to focus our attention. One of their main concerns in all areas was that the universities had not been paying enough attention to the needs of business and industry; this was true in the research library area as well as in basic scientific research and international studies. They were sympathetic to the idea that corporations must give more support to universities, but they did talk about universities being willing and able to provide more services to the corporations as well.

Since January, we have received many comments warning us not to emphasize new federal funding, in light of the Reagan administration's attitudes and its proposed budget cuts. We may add some disclaimers about the likelihood of getting new federal funds in most areas, but I do think that the needs that we talk about are clearly demonstrated and, in most cases, well documented. I also agree with Pat Battin's emphasis this morning on the importance of the principle of some degree of federal responsibility for the support of university research and training that is in the national interest. The amount of funding in any particular year may vary, but it should be an accepted principle that some federal support will be provided because the private sector cannot provide all that is needed. In some ways this may be less true in the library area, because you are already doing so much on your own and the amount of money that has been given to you so far is very small. But the principle that there should be some federal support for research library programs in the national interest ought to stand.

I do not intend to go over all the recommendations with you this morning, but rather to concentrate mainly on those that I already know to be somewhat controversial. I want to mention first the Research Libraries Council concept. It does not matter whether you call it a "committee" or a "council" or a "commission"; the idea is to form a group of librarians, scholars, and administrators to discuss research library problems and to try to reach some consensus on the way those problems should be approached. This is not really a new concept — a number of versions of it have been floating around for years. Some people have asked why we should set up a new organization to do this. The first version of the paper had a long

description of why all the existing organizations were inappropriate. I will not go through that whole litany, but in general they all have membership or a focus that is either too limited or too broad; they are too political or not political enough; none of them that I am aware of include library directors as well as scholars and university administrators. As you try to develop your own policies and reach consensus among yourselves, you will need the participation of those other groups in your deliberations. You need to be able to educate these people; you need to have their input and their agreement, and you will need — as I believe Arnie Goren would agree — their political clout if you are trying to get legislation or federal funding. If you do not have university presidents behind you in your requests to Congress, you will not get the assistance of people like Arnie Goren, who are assigned by university presidents to work on such issues in accordance with the perceived interest of the university as a whole.

From the point of view of educating faculty, scholarly societies, and other groups, I believe that a council could play a major role on a national level. As we were working on legislation for a national periodical center (NPC) last year, we were made very much aware that we had not consulted adequately with groups like that. We were stung with the sudden realization that scholarly societies had been alerted by the information industry to a proposal they considered a great threat to the small scholarly publications. If we had had a group like the proposed council, we might have avoided that particular buzz saw.

On the question of educating scholars, I keep remembering the distinguished dean who addressed this group last year on the need for changes in our values and life-style in response to the energy crisis. At the end of his presentation, Jo Harrar asked him what he would be willing to change, in terms of how he deals with the library, to meet those new needs. His immediate response was, "Don't move the books around so much." I submit that scholars like that are going to need a lot of assistance in learning to use some of the new technology for maintaining their access to materials which will be, at least in some fields, increasingly scarce on individual campuses.

There are major differences, I believe, between this proposal for a Research Libraries Council and the proposal that was around a couple of years ago for a national library agency. (I am glad, in a sense, that you all are not going to vote today on any of these recommendations, because I remember a vote at my first ARL meeting in October of 1978. I was ecstatic at a nearly-unanimous vote on ARL supporting the establishment of a national library agency, whose first task would be to establish a national periodical center. Since AAU had passed the same resolution, I happily ran off to try to get some legislation drafted and through Congress. Over many bitter months following that vote, I discovered that unanimous votes do not mean that there is unanimous agreement with all the points in a particular resolution.) One difference is that we are now proposing that the group be established solely by the private sector, without federal assistance or intervention. It might grow out of the work of the task forces recently established by the Council on Library Resources and the AAU with the help of ARL, as described by Jay Lucker during the Business Meeting. It might be established by some group like the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. It could be set up as a subgroup of an existing association. But we should not look to the government to do it for us.

Second, the council proposed here is not proposed as an operating agency. The idea is to try to get groups of scholars, librarians, and administrators together, to try to reach consensus on issues, to try to avoid confusion between what some of you are trying to do and what others are trying to do. Congress continually tells the higher education associations, "If you do not speak with one voice, you are going to lose your effectiveness with the Congress." Sometimes, that is impossible; there are occasionally splits between large and small institutions; there are, sometimes, splits on the public/private basis, as there is now on the issue of tax credits. But it is useful when we can reach compromises and speak with one voice on particular issues. They tell us the same thing on libraries — work together, speak as one. If ARL cannot carry ALA on an issue, you will not get anywhere; you must act politically. I agree that we need to cooperate with other library groups. And in the area of research libraries, we need to try, as much as possible, to speak with one voice — not just the librarians, but the other people who are involved: those who are the beneficiaries of the services that you provide, and those at the administrative level who provide most of your funding.

I believe, however, that it would be useful to have a group which focuses solely on research libraries. In my view there are problems with the idea which seems to have prevailed during the last few years that every piece of legislation and every group ought to include everybody who has any conceivable interest in the subject matter. This was one of the problems in our dealing with the Congress on the question of the national periodical center. The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) insisted on trying to include in that legislation the interests not only of scholars but of the general public and of the publishing and information industries. I believe that those who are interested in the health of research libraries need to focus on those libraries. If we attempt to include all the small public libraries, school libraries, the special libraries, the information industry, and the publishers in the council initially, we will never achieve the kind of consensus we need among ourselves. Certainly the council needs to work with these other groups; it is very important to keep them informed about what you are doing, to know what their interests are, to negotiate with them. But, I would strongly recommend a group that does focus on these particular problems of research libraries. It is important to bring in not only the university presidents but also the chief academic officers and provosts to whom, I gather, most of you report. This is the third main difference from earlier proposals.

I am delighted that the Association of American Universities has begun to be more active and involved in this area, and that the scholarly societies are also being brought in. AAU has just appointed a senior staff person who will be working on research libraries as well as on graduate education and humanities and arts. I think some of you have met him — Thomas Litzenburg, who comes to the AAU from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Tom will be working with many of you, and will be a liaison between you and the university presidents we work with in the AAU. But I do not think this effort should be limited only to AAU presidents and academic officers, and would encourage those of you who belong to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), for instance, and not to AAU, to try to get NASULGC interested in library issues. They have relied on AAU to carry most of the burden on research library questions, but their federal relations people are very helpful, as are those at the American Council on Education (ACE), in working with AAU on these issues. They will sign joint

statements on library issues, for example, if we can convince them that the issues are important to their members.

A second issue that I think is still controversial is whether we should continue to work hard for a national periodical center. I believe that we should. I know that some of you have lost your enthusiasm for that concept — if, indeed, you ever had it — but current developments in technology and budget restraints seem to me to make it both more necessary and more feasible than ever before. I am delighted to see ARL working with the Center for Research Libraries to establish an initial phase of such a service. I hope such a project will help to demonstrate that the broader NPC is indeed feasible. I am convinced that this is a national service which merits some federal funding. I do not think it will cost as much as some people believe it will. I do not believe that it will hurt the publishers of the small research journals as much as they think it will. But all of us need to work more with these publishers, to give them more information, show them the surveys that have been done, and discuss with them the bases on which libraries make decisions about acquisitions. If we work with the publishers and the scholars, perhaps we will have less difficulty on the next political go-round trying to get federal support for an NPC.

Third, the concept of the Centers of Special Responsibility is another area in which there is the same kind of controversy we were discussing this morning. That also, of course, is not a new concept, and much has been accomplished privately. Many of you participated in the Farmington Plan which provided for shared collection responsibility. The Research Libraries Group (RLG) is now working on a collection development program for sharing responsibilities among individual libraries.

One criticism I have received on this part of the paper concerns the proposal to concentrate Title II-C funds on the Centers of Special Responsibility. I would like to say that I agree with almost everything that was said this morning. That seems impossible, but I agree that the issue of "size" is the wrong issue to be talking about, and I would agree with those who would like to diminish or eliminate the importance of that criterion in Title II-C grants. It seems to me that what is important is the contribution to the potential national interest; the thing that counts, or should count, is the quality of the proposal, and how much it will help the system. Some of you who realize that concentrating these grants on such centers of special responsibility would not result in grants to your own institutions support it anyway. You have told me that such a policy would help you with your own acquisitions problems and with the overload that you are carrying on interlibrary loan. If it were made clearer that the major criterion for II-C grants is the way in which the proposed project will contribute to the system as a whole and to broaden access for scholars, and that the grants are not contributions to an individual research library to help only its own constituency, I think it is possible that some of the pressure for increased geographic distribution might be lessened. It is important to make sure that those grants reflect clearly, and most people believe that they reflect clearly, concentration on quality of the program and on support of the national interest.

If you believe that a system of such centers could function adequately without federal funding, that is, with the resources which the institutions can provide along with potential foundation grants, I should like to know that. As I have said, I do not believe we can be sanguine about the chance of greater federal funding than we now

have, at least for the next few years. On the other hand, if the possibility of an increased number of smaller grants through Title II-C is more important to you than the prospect of funding such Centers of Special Responsibility, ARL and AAU need to be aware of that in order to guide their policies.

I hope you will address these issues during the discussion. Some of the other recommendations also need some refinement. For instance, I admit that I do not really quite know what I mean by the recommendation that federal, state, corporate, and private foundation resources should be involved in a "coordinated effort to fund the transition to a new technology." The language was suggested to me by several people. It sounds like a good idea. I do not know who would coordinate the effort; I do not know how it would be coordinated, but maybe some of you will have some suggestions for actual mechanisms or for different language.

Preservation is an area where massive amounts of money will be needed. I do not know where those will come from; I do not know whether it would be possible to get more federal funding in this area. I do know that we will not get any federal funding unless people can agree on what needs to be done, and try to reach some agreement on priorities for attacking this very massive problem.

I would like to say how much I enjoyed working with all of you over the past three years, particularly during this past year while I have been developing this paper. I hope that the Membership and the Board of ARL will look at the proposals very carefully and decide which ones they want to act on. I hope that AAU will do the same thing. The AAU has not formally acted on the proposals; they have accepted them and discussed them, but not adopted them. Now that Tom Litzenburg is at AAU, he will work with you to help to identify the priorities of both university presidents and library directors, and to decide on appropriate action. Nothing will happen on these issues unless you make it happen. The Association of Research Libraries, working with other higher education associations and the new council and other groups, can play a crucial role in enabling the research libraries to meet the challenges that face them. If my paper helps to focus your attention on some of these issues, I will feel very rewarded, indeed.

MR. ROCHELL: Thank you, Barbara. Our first respondent is Margaret Child, who is the Assistant Director of the Research Resources Program in the Division of Research Grants at the National Endowment for the Humanities. Margaret has a Ph.D. in English and Medieval History from the University of Maryland, and she has taught at the University of Maryland and at the American University. At one time, Margaret was editor of the monthly Indonesian Press Survey, published by the Department of Commerce.

MS. CHILD (National Endowment for the Humanities): I am very pleased to be here, because Barbara and I have had a number of informal discussions over the last several months about the paper. I will confess that I really did not begin to grapple with it until I realized I was going to have to get up on this podium and say something formally. I have tried, over the last few days, to think much more deeply about it. This is in a way of warning Barbara that I may have changed my mind on some of the points that we discussed earlier.

I have no specific quarrel with most of the recommendations. In principle, I believe we are all supporters of concepts such as a system of centers of responsibility, or the need for a national plan for conservation and preservation, or the need for additional corporate support, which seems to be the latest enthusiasm in Washington for worthy causes of all kinds. Most of you would endorse these recommendations and, I believe, you would also endorse the underlying concept of the paper, which is that we need more coordination in setting goals and more long-range planning in order to determine what our goals really should be.

I have certainly found the consensus emerging out of the last discussion an interesting one: that grants made under Title II-C should be in the national good. The problem is determining what the "national good" is, and how specific grants can be used to attain that millennial objective. We need more and more informed dialogue among administrators, librarians, scholars, and funding agencies. All these ideas are worthy objectives. And, Barbara has very clearly wrestled for a long time over how to move from the position of simply endorsing or recommending ideas in principle to action. This, of course, is the perennial political problem of any kind of association or interest group, and what I want to focus on in my comments is the suggestion that there be a Research Libraries Council.

I find, in reading the paper again, that there is a dichotomy within the paper itself. Certain functions are recommended to this proposed council, but again and again, when specific goals need to be achieved, those tasks are assigned to existing entities — ARL, AAU, CLR, or all in combination, plus Title II-C and the whole range of bodies involved with research libraries — to reach some of these goals. I believe that there may be still some lack of certainty in the paper about the viability of setting up a new body. After five years of trying to achieve certain specific goals in the library community, with all the rather mysterious power of NEH behind me to conjure with and dollars — hard cash — to dangle in front of people's noses as an inducement, I am not sure that a body which has no power but verbal persuasion can really be effective. Maybe this is a cynical view, but I believe that effectiveness comes if you can either offer people concrete inducements to do

things or if you can threaten them with something horrible happening if they do not do what you would like to see done. It is the old carrot-and-the-stick mechanism. And, as I say, I question whether anything of the sort proposed in this paper could really, indeed, be effective.

I also have questions about whether this is the appropriate time to create yet another body. One of the speakers at the Business Meeting expressed the hope that you all have deputies at home tending to the store, as it were, so that you could spend all your time writing letters and lobbying Congress. It seems to me, from the frequency with which I see many of you, that you spend an awful lot of time going to meetings! Do you want another occasion on which to attend yet another set of meetings? Do we need, indeed, a new forum within which to discuss these admittedly urgent issues, and is the same forum appropriate for all the issues confronting the research library constituency?

I believe that the answer to those rather rhetorical questions is probably "no." I would, however, like to thank Barbara for at least proposing a way to look at the range of problems. I sense that underlying the discussion this morning on Title II-C was a feeling that perhaps the grants had not been made consistently under the broad context of the problems that research libraries face, and were not geared specifically towards solutions of those problems. This is something to which we must keep returning and discussing again and again. This paper provides a very useful occasion on which to consider the dimensions of the problem and to consider, perhaps if not setting up a new formal body, then other mechanisms which could be used to increase the dialogue and the thought given to these issues.

What we really need is a way to set an agenda for discussion. This is something that has frustrated me at many ARL meetings. When I first began coming to ARL meetings, I kept thinking I was going to get answers to the problems that were perplexing me. I was trying to help advise my review panels as to what our goals were and how our money could be used to seek solutions. And often I came away from these meetings without any answers at all, and without a feeling that there had been much effective discussion at these sessions.

Now we have the beginnings of an agenda and an opportunity to provide a wide range of information on and analysis of the various options for the agenda items and to build a consensus. It would seem to me that we are beginning to have an informal mechanism in place — one to which Barbara has just referred — in the fact that the AAU is now clearly focusing on this problem, to the extent of devoting a single staff person to the issue of the role of the university library in the research university. This is a very helpful and informed step. This could be complemented by devoting a full time staff person at ARL, perhaps for a year or more, to focus clearly on long range policy issues to identify these issues, assemble the information, and feed that information out to the Membership. If we could then move ACLS to concentrate in the same way on the issue, you would then begin to have tapped all the constituencies which this paper suggests that we need to involve, and begin, then, to have some structure and some basis for the kind of dialogue that I believe we need.

That is all I have to say, at this moment. I hope it has been provocative.

MR. ROCHELL: Thank you. Our second panelist is Ann Greenberg, who holds a Masters in Public Administration from New York University and a Certificate

from the Harvard Business School Institute for Educational Management. She is currently Director of NYU's Office of Sponsored Programs, and is a member of the Society of Research Administrators, the New York Academy of Science, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the American Association for the Advancement of the Humanities.

MS. GREENBERG (New York University): I am not going to comment directly on the recommendations. Like Arnold Goren, I too claim the privilege of ignorance. I propose simply to share briefly with you some attitudes and concerns of my clients — the research faculty — in the hope that this will add a dimension to your consideration of the issues on the table which I find lacking, so far, in this morning's discussion.

I grew up with a notion that libraries were somewhere between Mom and apple pie, thanks in large measure to the librarian who looked after our small-town, volunteer library when I was a child, and guided my socialization into the wonderful world of books. Since then, I have been a student and an administrator, and have learned, as most of us must, that not only is Eden not just around the corner, but that there is little or no agreement on how to get there from here.

The problems of the research library strike me as particularly complicated ones, which I doubt that all the money in the world could solve. The same people, as part of a coherent unitary role, are, at different times, customer and supplier. As customers, as you know only too well, they bring a broad spectrum of needs. Life was much simpler, I am sure, when scholars were, literally by definition, humanists whose output tended to be the product of years of comtemplation and reflection, its foundation the published thoughts and ideas of predecessors. Their way of life made an impression on the libraries that, I sense, was close to cast-in-concrete for the ages until long after the new clientele, the scientist, appeared on the scene.

Today, your problems have multiplied — the information explosion, inflation, and a world of finite resources being only a short list. Add to that the underlying reality that the library is not the research tool for the scientist. His armamentarium is the laboratory, the computer, or even still for some, the blackboard. His efforts and outputs govern, in large measure, the designation "research university" in this country — indeed, the amount of funding received by any given institution to support the research of its scientists is the basis of the National Science Foundation's annual ranking of research universities. For good measure, comtemplate this contrast. Today, the cost of providing for a newly-recruited Edith Wharton Scholar all primary and secondary materials currently in print is under $600; start-up instrumentation costs for a "frontier" synthetic organic chemistry laboratory have recently been reported by an AAU study as close to $44,000 in 1979. Consider, too, aside from tuition, the income brought to the university through research grants and contracts, and the attractability of influence, in actuality or promise, that it can have on the institution's budget resource allocation processes — a heady mixture, indeed.

Yet another aspect of this many-sided dilemma is the practical problem of how to deal with the information flood. Improved technology, of course, seems to promise the solutions, as it has for all kinds of societal problems in recent history. But, as we have already learned in other contexts, it also usually brings a new generation of problems, like its escalating costs. Also, it is at the heart of many

scientific techniques, and so to some as comfortable as pencil and paper. This will cause greater imbalance in the already unstable academic equation. In an era of scarce resources, these disparities between the haves and have-nots will, in all probability, grow.

Is there a way to ease the tensions, as negotiations and planning and implementation stages unfold? Let me say straight out that I do not know how to do it, but I am convinced that all your customers — humanists and scientists alike — must be drawn more directly into these processes if the present uneasy consensus is not to erode further. In this context, a construct occurs to me, which might be worth exploring. I make no apology for my choice of image. In fact, it is quite deliberate. Consider characterizing the research library as a launching pad; each and every scholar's venture into new territory — be he classicist or astrophysicist — becomes a trip into orbit. Both the angle of the lift-off and the shape of the orbit are determined by the state of existing thought and knowledge. Subsequent launches will build on the new sum of knowledge. The library's role may be then seen, in part, as analogous to NASA's Mission Control: contributing to the design process, monitoring the ship's progress, guiding its safe return, then cataloging the data gathered on the mission and making it available to succeeding voyagers.

And, now, returning to earth. My intuition tells me that the need for attention to the attitudes and values of your customers is a whole task in itself. Without it, I do not believe you will be able to counter the impulses to fragmentation, convert the dissidents, and, finally, command the support without which your continuing central role in the lives of all scholars — scientists and humanists alike — will be in jeopardy. Thank you.

MR. ROCHELL: Thank you, Ann. Our final speaker on the program is David Esplin, who is the Associate Librarian for Book Selection and Acquisitions at the University of Toronto. David has also worked at the University of Otago in New Zealand, where he received a BA in History and Political Science, and at the libraries of the University of California, University of London, and the British Museum. He is presently a member and Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproduction, and is the Chairman of the Research Resources Committee of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

MR. ESPLIN (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada): I am more fortunate than the last speaker on a panel and other panels that have appeared here. I have not had to listen to all the ideas which I had written down being expounded by other people, and then try to pull together the little knowledge that remains to make a speech.

I have been asked to talk to you about the Canadian experience with federal support for libraries. Because the British North America Act of 1867 — which, at the moment, is the Canadian constitution — says that education is a provincial responsibility, the federal government cannot be seen to grant money directly to provincial educational institutions. And, with that, I come to the first of the three kinds of federal support for university and research libraries, support which is a large part of their skeleton, muscle, and blood. Block funding from the federal government to the provinces, without description for what are called "established

programs," were 53.8 percent of the monies spent by the provinces in 1979-1980 for health and post-secondary education. That, of course, is an average figure; in some of the provinces, the federal contribution is a higher percent of the total provincial expenditures. Thus, the universities and their libraries are funded in part by federal and in part by provincial money. As to the future of federal support in Canada, the federal government has said it wishes to renegotiate the funding of established programs as Canada's economic situation worsens — a wish appearing to bear some strong similarity to that in the United States. Our view of the future of federal funding is not entirely optimistic.

The second of the three kinds of federal support comes from the federal libraries. There are many of these, but I will mention only two. The National Library of Canada, whose Librarian, Guy Sylvestre, is with us today, was founded in January 1952, and supports libraries, including university and research libraries, in many ways. Some examples: the union catalog system, which is in the process of development and provides a machine readable database, with links to other existing databases in the country; the national bibliography, both the current and the retrospective bibliography; the Canadian MARC Service; and the National Library is a last-resort contributor to interlibrary lending in Canada.

The second of the federal libraries is the Canadian Institute for Scientific and Technical Information, familiarly called CISTI. It was founded, in its present form, in 1974, and its mandate is "to promote and provide for the use of scientific and technical information by the people and government of Canada." "Scientific," here, includes "health sciences," and "people" means "direct service to individuals." The Institute has current periodical subscriptions that total about 33,000 titles and, in the past year, CISTI filled about 180,000 requests. Of these, 75 percent were filled from its own resources, 15 percent from other Canadian library collections, leaving ten percent which were largely unfillable. Of the total filled requests, 23 percent were for university libraries. One of the other services is CAN/OLE, Canadian Online Enquiry, which mounts 18 databases, of which five, such as Chemical Abstracts and Biological Abstracts, are commercial bases, and the remaining 13 are indigenous Canadian bases.

The third kind of federal support comes from what I call "grant-giving agencies." In 1976, the then Canada Council — it still exists, but its function has been changed and the organization which is now concerned with research libraries is the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council — convened a small group of librarians and scholars. The purpose of this group was to advise the Canada Council on setting up a program of library grants to strengthen the research collections in the humanities and social sciences in Canadian university libraries, either from a national or regional perspective. A further direction given by the Council was to ask the group to think in terms of not only continuing programs but also effective use of single substantial sums. The report was issued in 1978, with the title, "University Research Libraries," and there were four main recommendations:

1. a national lending library, with particular emphasis on a periodicals lending service (this is still under consideration by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council);

2. a program of grants to maintain and develop specialized collections of national significance in Canadian university libraries;

3. if funds were, in fact, made available for a program of grants, ten percent of these funds are to be reserved for funding special opportunities in library acquisitions;

4. that the Canada Council endow an appropriate organization with the sum of $2 million, with both principle and interest to be used exclusively for the creation of a microform collection of Canadiana printed before 1900.

Recommendations two, three and four were accepted. Two and three were passed to the newly-created Social Science and Humanities Research Council, and number four was implemented by the old Canada Council, in its dying days, when it handed it to the officers of the newly-created, federally-chartered nonprofit organization — which is also registered as a charitable institution, so it can receive gifts and give receipts to be set against income tax -- called the Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions. It is a very awkward name, but we were told that after searching the register of federally-chartered companies, it has to be this; it was the only name that would really distinguish it from other companies. The Institute took rather longer than we anticipated to get going, because we had a long search for the right person to organize such an undertaking. But, we were fortunate; such a person was found. And, to spare you any more agony by going into further detail, last month in Ottawa a reception was held to announce the distribution of the first 5,000 titles of microfiche, accompanied by machine readable cataloging for same, which was produced in close collaboration and with the use of the facilities of the National Libraries. In the first instance, monographs are being located and filmed in Canada, but the search is spreading beyond the country and, last month, an agreement was reached with the Library of Congress to film material in their collections which we have, so far, not found in Canada. Eventually, we hope to go through relevant collections in Europe as well.

Recommendations two and three have been implemented by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Under the title "Research Resources Program," this program has two parts in line with the recommendations: grants for specialized collections of national significance, and what has been called a "fleeting opportunities fund." We are just into the third year of this grant program and, in line with the perceived inadequacy of your Title II budget, you will see that ours is also inadequate and, in fact, even more laughable. In the first year, we had a total of $440,000 and, in this, the third year, we have a total of $700,000. That is an impressive increase. Unfortunately, we are informed that we have probably hit a plateau and that the amount will stay at about that sum.

Given the amount of funds, clearly we must have very precisely defined and very limited objectives if, in fact, we are going to have any effect at all. So, the money is for the purchase of materials to enhance collections. There is no question of overhead, no question of anything else. Any institution which applies for a grant must spend it on materials, and materials alone. The grants are made each year. The institution is allowed three years in which to spend the grant, and must report at the end of that time. Because the amount of money is so low and because there is at least as great, if not greater, disparity between the libraries who may apply for the money (all recognized university institutions in Canada, of which there are over 50), we have put an upper limit on the total of any one grant. That upper limit is ten percent of the available funds, so it has been until now $40,000 per year.

We have no great difficulty in identifying collections of national significance. The problem that the committee has struggled with, is struggling with and, undoubtedly, will continue to struggle with is the question of regional significance in relation to national significance. We think we are making some progress — but then, we have not exposed our latest thoughts to our constituency, because I am quite sure when we do, we will realize that we have not made any progress at all.

The "fleeting-opportunities fund" was created to give a subsidy to institutions who were fortunate enough to have an offer of material which was exclusive to them, and which had a time limit. In this program we asked that the university concerned to match the grant, dollar for dollar. The administration of this program is done by phone, and we promise to get back to the institution within ten days of receipt of the application to tell them if this grant has been successful.

I hope I have not told you more than you want to know, about Canada — I am afraid I may have! And, please allow me a private word of apology to my Canadian colleagues, because I am sure I have treated the subject very superficially. Thank you.

MR. ROCHELL: Thank you, David. This morning we have heard from Barbara Turlington regarding those recommendations from the Research Universities Project which she believes are controversial, including the Research Libraries Council, access to periodicals, and centers of responsibility. She also asked us to continue discussing the report and to reach a point where we might act on it in some version. Margaret Child followed, and agreed that the recommendations covering centers of responsibility, preservation, corporate support, etc., are desirable, but concludes that it is not timely, at this point, to pursue the Research Libraries Council, and suggests that this organization not be created. She urges ARL to sharpen our focus on the long-range policy planning and concerns, array our options, and learn how to reach consensus and decisions on those options and suggestions; that a full-time person at ARL might need to work on these activities over the coming years and, through that vehicle, link with a counterpart in AAU, ACLS, etc. to accomplish the goals described in the report. Ann Greenberg described the tensions which exist between the humanists and the scientists, the haves and have-nots, and told us that those tensions are likely going to increase, and that given the move into technology by libraries, we must find better vehicles for communication among ourselves, the humanists, the scientists, etc., and gives us an intriguing model of the library's "Mission Control." David gave us a quick and fairly thorough overview of the Canadian scene — and, certainly, parts of that description relate to this morning's discussion on Title II-C, as well as the proposal before us. And I think, particularly, we should study the work going on in the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. With that summary, I will open the floor for any questions you might have.

MR. PINGS (Wayne State University): In my recent reading, a phrase came up, in which the point was made that the time has passed in which we can devote efforts to small-scale social cohesion. I think Miss Turlington's paper is perhaps an effort to look at a somewhat larger scale social cohesion. One may have objections to bits and pieces of this, and many have called attention to the fact that we do not have social cohesion in our separate parts. Are we ever going to get the answer to that, necessarily, the way we are going? Are we going to get larger social cohesion? Now, if you are going to accept this search for the large-scale, you make large

errors, but I do not think that we should necessarily be afraid of a large error because, if we mount a program for large-scale social cohesion and it does not work, there is going to be another, larger group ready to take over. I guess this is as much testimony as I can give. I would hate to have us just argue over bits and pieces, to stop movement and thought. I do not know where the AAU paper is going to go — I hope, however, towards a larger social cohesion.

MR. ROCHELL: Thank you. We are about to run out of time, but I would like to give the speaker a chance to give a 30-second summing up.

MS. TURLINGTON: I am disappointed that we do not have time for critiques of this paper here. I would like to encourage you — particularly within the next week or two — to write me, call me, send letters, telegrams, whatever, and tell me some of your responses to the proposals in the paper, and suggestions, whether they are minor or major, for improving and reconsidering it.

MR. ROCHELL: Thank you. We owe Barbara a great deal for thinking through this and setting up a framework for the broader considerations and atmosphere within which we operate. There are many aspects of that report that we must continue to look at as an organization. Our thanks to you, Barbara, and to the panel.

BUSINESS MEETING

Report of the Interim Executive Director

MR. McCOY: This will be a brief report, since our recent ARL Newsletter has brought you up to date on Association activities.

On the legislative front, it appears that the budget recommended by President Reagan will prevail in the Congress, although it may be late summer before appropriations are actually made. But, here is the way the 1982 funding currently stands on programs that are of interest to research libraries. In the Higher Education Act, there is no funding for Title II-A, "College Library Resources," but Title II-B, "Research and Demonstration," and Title II-C, "Strengthening Research Library Resources," are still funded at the 1981 level, with $6 million for Title II-C. The National Endowment for the Humanities is budgeted at 50 percent of the 1981 level, but there is a coalition of interested groups pressing for a less severe cut. There is also a coalition to save the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) grant authorization, which would be abolished under the Reagan budget, endangering the life of 40 or more projects involving publication of papers of distinguished Americans. A bill to authorize a two-year extension of the NHPRC grant program, with a 25 percent reduction in budget, carries bipartisan support and may have a chance of passage this year when the appropriations are considered.

We have been very much concerned this year — as I know you have been — over a possible cutback in the budget for the Library of Congress, which would have a very serious effect on all our libraries. Our call to library directors for support of LC's budget brought forth a gratifying response which, I have no doubt, had a beneficial effect. While the LC budget for 1982 is still uncertain, I think there is some cause for optimism, because an LC supplemental appropriation for 1981 was recently approved for 82 percent of the amount requested.

We have also been encouraged by the interest in Congress in restoring tax credits to authors and artists who contribute their works to libraries and museums. Eight separate bills to this effect have been introduced in the present Congress with bipartisan support. Here again, our appeal to library directors to support the bill introduced by Senator Baucus of Montana resulted in a response that amazed and pleased the Senator and his staff. Since this measure is not directly related to the budget cuts, and there does not seem to be any organized opposition to it, there is a fair chance of its passage, though we will have to continue to press.

Despite the efforts of Congressman Paul Simon and others on behalf of libraries, the Postal Service subsidy recommended in the Reagan budget — and likely to be approved — calls for a 138 percent increase in the fourth class/library rate by October 1, 1981.

One of our recent concerns, which grew out of the experience last year in trying to establish a National Periodical Center, was the apparent lack of adequate communication between librarians and scholars about research libraries. We have

addressed this issue on a very small scale, and with some success, at our recent meeting sponsored by the ARL and the American Association for the Advancement of the Humanities (AAAH), supported by a small grant from the Council on Library Resources. The library directors and a professor of English from each of three institutions — Michigan, North Carolina, and Princeton — joined by Margaret Child of the NEH, James Banner, chair of AAAH, and ARL staff members, spent a day in Washington last month discussing ways in which faculty members in the humanities might become informed on issues and problems facing research libraries. The group agreed upon several measures to be taken, on experimental bases, at their respective institutions and with scholarly societies. You will be receiving a report on this meeting. It seemed to some of us that it might be worthwhile to have similar small-group discussions with other disciplines and their respective societies.

The invitational meeting on the economics and financial structure of research libraries, sponsored jointly by ARL and the Research Libraries Group, with a grant from the Council on Library Resources, will be held in early October, postponed from an earlier date in June. The state-of-the-art papers have been completed for the conference: "A Strategic Planning Model of the University Library," by Jerome Yavarkovsky of Columbia and "Academic Library Decision Support Systems," by Michael Bommer of Clarkson College. A small group of library directors (from both OCLC and RLG libraries), economists, and university administrators will be invited to participate. David Breneman, an economist with the Brookings Institution, will be the moderator, and Carol Francis, who has been working in this area for the American Council on Education, will also be on the program.

A review of the work of the Center for Chinese Research Materials, which has been in operation for about thirteen years, was undertaken last month by the Center's advisory committee, headed by Philip McNiff. The Center's emphasis for the next three years will be on the reproduction of significant Chinese-language newspapers, serials, and archival materials that have recently become available to the Center from various sources in Taiwan, London, and Moscow, and, also on material from the People's Republic of China that may result from the recent exchange visits of librarians. The advisory committee also expressed the desire that the work of the Center be given greater publicity among the ARL Membership, with a possibility of a place on the program at a future ARL meeting. The Center is financed by funds from NEH and the Mellon Foundation, and income from sales of Center publications; for its sponsorship, ARL receives an overhead grant stipend from the grant fund.

We are pleased to announce that the long-awaited publication, Cumulated ARL University Library Statistics, 1962-63 through 1978-79, will be available in June, and a copy will be sent to each ARL library.

In concluding my sixteen months as Interim Executive Director, I want to express my appreciation for the privilege of serving the Association, and to thank all of you for the support that you have given me. I am particularly grateful to the Board and to President Jay Lucker. I found that Jay is a very remarkable person. He is able to keep abreast of all the various activities in the Association, and yet he manages, somehow, to delegate responsibility so that the work of the Association gets done. And, Jay, I have certainly enjoyed working with you. My special appreciation goes to the ARL staff, to Carol Mandel, the very efficient Associate Executive Director who has been a real delight to work with this year; to Duane

Webster and his fine OMS Staff, for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration; to Nicola Daval, our able editor and conference organizer. I think the Association is very fortunate to have a staff of competent, hard-working, and dedicated people.

Finally, no one is more delighted than I am, Shirley, that you have, at long last, arrived. A new ARL President who is taking office is presented with a gavel by the retiring President, as a symbol of office. So, I tried to think of what I might present to you as a symbol of the Office of Executive Director, and all I could come up with was my American Express card. So, I would like to present this to you; don't leave home without it!

Report of the Executive Director

MS. ECHELMAN: Thank you, Ralph, you may be sure that I won't!

I am very honored to be here today. I have thought a lot about what I could possibly say to you all on this occasion, and decided that it would not be a good idea to attempt a complete review of ARL, as I have been at the Office for only three days. That would be analogous to trying to learn the Torah while standing on one foot — and, I am not up to either of those tasks.

I would like to thank all of the ARL directors and other friends who have written and called me during the past six months since my appointment was announced offering cooperation, support, best wishes, condolences, and a whole range of other comments. All of this well-wishing has been very sustaining during the past six months, because I have been attempting to learn as much as possible about ARL — which, as many of you probably do not remember from the days before you were directors, is a rather mysterious organization to the rest of the library world — and about the issues which are of concern to its members while, at the same time, continuing to keep activities going at the Medical Library Association and trying to ensure as smooth a transition there as possible. You may be interested to know that the print out of a literature search about the Association of Research Libraries produced two and a half pounds of computer paper — citations only — and I tried to read as many of the documents as I possibly could. In addition, Ralph, Carol, Nicky, and Duane have been sending me material on a more or less regular basis, and I have been able to meet several times with Ralph and with the staff since January. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of them for their patient and thorough orientation.

I am reminded these days of my sophomore year at the University of Wisconsin — I have been around just long enough to know that I do not know anything! I actually arrived at ARL last Wednesday afternoon, and I must say, I am enormously happy to be working at a single job again. Even though it is far too early to report that I have settled in, I have put some things on the desktop, changed the pencil holder, and moved the phone around.

Jay Lucker suggested that it might be useful to tell you a little bit about my specific interests and how I think they will fit with ARL's goals and programs. I feel obligated to begin by telling you that which most of you probably already know: I

am not now, nor have I ever been, nor will I ever be, a scholar. My background lies in management and organization, although I came to New York from Nebraska to be a dancer — but, we will not mention anything more about that! — I am very much interested in the organization and financial structure of the Association of Research Libraries and how the structure can be strengthened so that it effectively supports the roles and the goals that were discussed yesterday evening and that have been of concern to ARL directors for a number of years.

I am interested in the coordination of efforts by research libraries to improve the national resource represented by all libraries. I am interested in education for librarianship, in recruitment to the profession, and in the related and, I believe, very serious issue of salary and status in the profession. I have some interest in an assessment of the international role of the Association and its relationship to the needs of the members. I am interested in broadening the base of support for research libraries and in the public information role of the Association, not only in the scholarly community — which is certainly very important — but with the library community at large, which knows so little about ARL, and with the wide academic, governmental, and business communities, which are potential sources of support for ARL activities. I have had a modicum of experience in connecting public sector and private sector organizations, and I hope to be able to put that experience to good use. I am interested in getting out and talking with you all, in unstructured or structured settings, in your own libraries or whenever possible. ARL's budget is a tight one, but I intend to make an effort, whenever I am travelling, to come in and listen to any of you who are within visiting distance, if you have time to talk with me. It is my feeling that the mission of research libraries is so large in scope and the issues so complex and so fraught with risk that it is very tempting for all of us to hide in smaller and more manageable corners of the problem. You cannot afford to do that, and I think you all know that — and, because you cannot afford to, ARL cannot afford to, either.

The relationship of libraries to learning and to the furtherance of knowledge is very poorly understood in our society, although it is a society which depends very heavily on the continuous advancement of the frontiers of knowledge. Dr. Rudenstine said this morning that libraries are the engine of the academic enterprise. I prefer an anatomical metaphor (from my recent background at MLA), and I therefore like to think of libraries as the heart of the academic organism. Without the libraries acting as the pump, the blood will not flow through the academic body, and the body will die. It is difficult to display that relationship consistently to the various constituencies with whom you are all concerned. The relationship was much clearer in simpler times — for example, during the Dark Ages. I guess they are still called the "Dark Ages," those centuries after Rome fell when scholarship nearly died. There arose here and there in Northern Europe small centers of scholarly monasticism whose mission was to keep alive some of the learning of previous days. That era came to an end, really, with the aid of a librarian, a man named Alcuin of York. He epitomizes, in my mind, the relationship between civilization, scholarship, and librarianship. We do not know very much about his personal history, but there is a plaque in York Minster which is dedicated by the monks of York as follows: "In memory of Alcuin, a Member of our Order: librarian, teacher, advisor to Charlemagne; he brought light into the darkness of Europe." That is the role of the research library — very clearly stated on that plaque.

I would like to ask your help; I have a great deal to hear and to learn from all of you, and I intend to spend as much time as possible listening. I was charmed by Dr. Kell's story this morning. I promise you, if I hear anyone call "Pig," I will stop the car immediately, get out, walk up the road and look around the bend, before driving on! But, it is up to you all to yell "Pig" as necessary.

Some who have written me have asked whether I had any opinions about what the open and hidden agendas for research libraries are, whether I understood what the stakes are, whether I knew where the vested interests lie. I have given some thought to these questions, and I believe ARL does have a vested interest, and it does have both open and hidden agendas, and it does hold some stakes. Its vested interest is in strong and healthy research libraries; that is both its open and its hidden agenda, and those are our stakes. And I can only promise you that, as best I can, I will attempt to further those interests, accomplish the agenda, and play the stakes to the advantage of the Association and all its members. Thank you very much.

Report of the Office of Management Studies

MR. WEBSTER: This morning's program provided a review of the Association's interest in management issues over the last ten years. This afternoon, I will quickly report on the present status of OMS projects and our future plans.

Thirty-two studies are operating within the framework of the Academic Library Program. Ten of these studies are being conducted by OMS-trained consultants and the remaining studies are managed by OMS Staff. Included are seven collection analysis studies, five library planning studies, three preservation studies, one public services study, two organizational screening projects, and a technical services review study. The studies operated by OMS-trained consultants are all part of the Lilly Endowment Small Library Planning Project, which is coming to a close this fall. There is also a growing interest among ARL members in using OMS Staff to assist in the design and conduct of limited, carefully-focused internal studies.

In February, the Office staff completed the selection of participants for the second Consultation Skills Training Program. The 20 librarians selected participated in an intensive, two-week consultation-skills workshop in March. This program is attempting to select some of the best, most competent academic librarians available, and then to provide them with the planning and analytical skills required for managing problem-solving in a library. These are process-oriented skills that can be used in a variety of settings and include communication, problem articulation, analysis of issues, and determining decision-making requirements. Consulting is simply one way of developing and using these skills. The experience and skill gained by the participants is then available for subsequent use in ARL and other libraries.

Efforts are also continuing to secure financial support from corporate foundations for developing an assisted self-study of public services in academic libraries. We are doing some of the design work on the public services project within present funding arrangements. For example, the University of Houston is

completing an internal study of public services for which we are providing consulting assistance. The Office expects to be able to assist additional libraries in doing public services studies by this fall. We have added a part-time staff member, Jane Benson, to assist in advancing this effort. Jane is also working part time at the Council on Library Resources as CLR Publications Officer.

In another area, two occasional papers are being prepared for publication this spring, covering internal communication in academic libraries and compensation practices of research libraries. These papers are an outgrowth of our Collaborative Research/Writing Project.

Five SPEC flyers and kits have been issued since the last ARL Membership Meeting: two on preservation, two covering the results of our public services survey last year, and the fifth on executive reviews in ARL libraries, reflecting some of the discussions held at the ARL Membership Meeting in May 1980. Maxine Sitts has put together a schedule of topics for forthcoming flyers and kits, including fees for services, online data base services, staff and professional development, use of small computers in libraries, internships, recruitment and employment practices, specialists' positions, and departmental libraries.

In the OMS training program, a Management Skills Institute was held in Austin, Texas, this year and a special focus workshop on performance appraisal is being planned at Michigan next week. A workshop on the management of stress we conducted in Virginia last month attracted about 80 participants, and we are putting together a Management Skills Institute to be held in Columbus, Ohio, in conjunction with Ohio State. Ohio State took advantage of the offer made in our last report, namely that OMS is prepared to do a Management Skills Institute at any member library that is willing to assure us of 20 participants.

In another area, the preservation project supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities was an important focus of our attention in the last several months. Pamela Darling is coordinator for that project. I would like her to take a few minutes to comment on the status of that effort.

MS. DARLING: Since I spoke to you last fall, we have completed drafting the self-study manual, except for one chapter, and compiled the technical resource information that accompanies it. We selected, from among 18 applicants, three libraries for the pilot-testing of the materials: the libraries of Dartmouth College, the University of Virginia and the University of Washington. Those tests are now under way. We are about a third of the way through the process. Let me just briefly outline for you the three phases of the self-study project.

A preliminary analysis of the situation and detailed design of the data gathering phase occupies about a month, followed by a six to eight week period of intensive data gathering, focused on five specific areas: a review of the environmental conditions of the collections; a review of the physical conditions of the materials themselves; an analysis of the organizational structure and activities that currently affect the preservation of the materials — whether, in fact, they are known as preservation activities within the institution; a look at the library's ability to handle crises which physically threaten the materials — floods, fire, other kinds of disasters; and, finally, an identification of the types of resources available within the institution, the campus, the community, and the region to support expanded preservation activities.

The final phase of the self-study process involves an analysis of all of that information and a structured process for developing recommendations and a detailed action plan for an ongoing, expanded, growing preservation program. As I say, we are under way in the testing of this material. It is a little soon to tell whether, in fact, it will work, but it does appear that things are going well. We expect to finish the pilot testing in midsummer, and spend the fall revising and improving the materials, which will then be made available some time after the first of the year.

What makes this particular study program different from some previous activities is the very large technical component. This enormous notebook I am clutching represents a composite of some of the technical material being provided to support the process of self-study. There are about 700 pages of relatively current information that has been compiled to provide people with a solid technical basis for the kinds of administrative decisions that must be made. We feel that this is crucial in this particular area — which is, as you know, new and rapidly changing. And one of the things that we will need to look at very closely before this project ends is how to continue to provide the kind of current technical information that is needed to support preservation programs that will reliably assure the life of our collections.

MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Pam. The OMS Advisory Committee met earlier today and reviewed some of the discussions of this morning, as well as the discussions held last night. They also considered topics that the OMS staff should address in the future. For example, they suggested that a formal method be established that would allow the OMS Advisory Committee to be in direct contact with individual directors concerning operation of the OMS. They have also asked us to devise a method for providing of an ongoing assessment and review of OMS activities.

Finally, the 1980 annual report for the Office reviewing the last year's activities, has been drafted and will be sent to you shortly. All of us at the Office appreciate receiving comments from you or your staff on the activities. [A summary of the OMS 1980 Annual Report appears on p. 97.]

I would like to close by again thanking Ralph for his support, help, and insight over the brief time he has been here. He has had an extraordinary impact on what we have been doing, and has made an extraordinary contribution to the Association. And all of us, of course, are looking forward to an energetic and productive relationship with Shirley. Thank you.

Report on the CLR Bibliographic Services Development Program

MR. JONES (Council on Library Resources): As you may recall, there are four basic areas of activity in the Bibliographic Services Development Program (BSDP): standards, access to bibliographic information, the quality of bibliographic data bases, and products that flow from those bibliographic data bases. Since my report in October, our activities in the area of standards have not been spectacular. We continue with efforts on a detailed holdings standard and a standard for institutional IDs, and we have just started to negotiate for work on an application level protocol, i.e., a set of protocols to control communications between computers in bibliographic and information transactions.

In the area of linking bibliographic information from a variety of data bases, the Battelle report is now out, and CLR's supply has been exhausted. It continues to be available through ERIC — not, however, at $9.00 per copy, but at $28 or $29 per copy I believe, in paper, though substantially less in microform. A continuing element in the Battelle study is the BIBLINK model developed by Battelle. The model compares what happens when you change various elements in a link situation, e.g., when you link, for purposes of interlibrary loans or shared cataloging, and raise or lower rates and costs. That model is available to anyone who would like to use it. Each of the shared cataloging services — my new term for the bibliographic utilities — and 12 library schools have taken advantage of the availability of the model. The library schools, particularly, are looking at the model from a number of perspectives. We hope to have a report from them early in the fall.

Discussions about linking continue. The link for CONSER purposes at present appears to be contribution of records through the Library of Congress. A project that we fund to link the authority systems of the Washington Library Network, the Research Libraries Group's RLIN, and LC continues to make progress, and we expect to receive a proposal to implement that link this fall. Jim Rush and Norman Stevens have prepared a paper on the roles of state and multi-state networks. That document is undergoing staff review; it will be forwarded to all state and multi-state networks for their review and evaluation. If any of you have an interest in it, I hope you will request a copy of the document from the Council.

Data base quality. We have a number of projects in process in the authority area; most of you know some of them. The Name Authority File Service, which is under review by a task force funded by the Council, has prepared a requirements statement. Each of you has received a copy. We would like to have any comments, criticisms, suggestions as soon as possible. We have a number of sub-tasks identified, and work is under way to accomplish them. Last year, I urged any of you with ideas and suggestions in the area of subject authorities to step forward. Carol Mandel did, as a matter of fact, and she has just produced a concept paper for the Council. Her paper is under staff review and it will be discussed by the BSDP Program Committee in July, with the idea of trying to identify how, if in any way, the program can make a contribution to subject access and control.

Our final area of activity, the one taking up most of our time, is of considerable interest to many of you: the evaluation of online public access catalogs. I reported to you in October that Phase One, the phase in which we would identify how to evaluate these catalogs, was under way. The Research Libraries Group, OCLC, Joe Mathews Associates, and the University of California are all cooperating in developing evaluation tools — questionnaires, interview instruments, sampling strategies, and a methodology for evaluating the collected data — and Phase One will be completed at the end of May. Beginning the first of June, those same institutions, with the addition of the Library of Congress and possibly UTLAS, will begin collecting data on between 12 and 20 different online public access catalogs. We anticipate that preliminary data will be available and released near the end of 1981, with completed data evaluation available in mid to late 1982.

We have produced a two-year report on the Bibliographic Services Development Program, which is available upon request. We have also been in the process of developing a "futurist" paper outlining what the program intends to do over the course of the next three years, and near the end of the summer that should also be available.

Duane already mentioned that the Council has added Jane Benson, on a half-time basis. We have added two other staff members, as well — Deanna Marcum and Keith Russell are now Program Associates with the Council.

Report on the CLR Professional Education and Training for Research Librarianship Program

MR. McDONALD (University of Connecticut): I do appreciate the opportunity to provide the ARL Membership with a brief update on PETREL, CLR's program of Professional Education and Training for Research Librarianship. This is the single most appropriate audience for such a report, since it is for your libraries that the program is being undertaken, and it is with your cooperation that the program will succeed.

You recall that PETREL got under way, informally, early last year. It was officially approved by the CLR board about a year ago, and it was formally announced on October 1, 1980. As with most things Jim Haas touches, this program has made rapid progress. The PETREL advisory committee consists of Rudy Rogers, Yale; Bob Vosper, University of California, Los Angeles Graduate School of Library and Information Science; Margot McBurney, Queens; Russell Bidlack, University of Michigan School of Library Science; William Gerberding, President, University of Washington, and John McDonald, Connecticut. We have held a number of meetings and have conducted site visits to the library schools at the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, and UCLA. It is not coincidental that these three institutions have received the first CLR grants under the PETREL program. The amount of that support totals about $740,000, and the awards to each institution are based on carefully-written proposals which have been modified and refined as a result of detailed discussions with the PETREL Advisory Committee and the CLR staff — particularly with Jim Haas, who has assumed personal responsibility for this program. A recent news release from the Council and a notice in the ARL Newsletter of April 27, 1981 described how each library school intends to use its grants. It may be unnecessary, but let me run through that information again at this time.

The University of Chicago's Graduate Library School, in cooperation with its Graduate School of Business, will establish a special postgraduate program leading to a Certificate of Advanced Study in Library Management. The course will include interdisciplinary study in library science and management, a special seminar to continue throughout the period of study, and investigative internships at participating research libraries. The University of Michigan's School of Library Science will begin an active recruiting program designed to attract a small number of highly-qualified students to specialize in research librarianship in an extended academic program, one of about 20 months rather than the normal program of a year; additional course work in related disciplines, research library internships, and placement assistance will be included in this new basic professional education program.

UCLA's program has two discrete components. The first will provide specialized training for librarians who have recently assumed planning/management posts; a six-week course emphasizing managerial skills for research librarians, with

periodic follow-up sessions during the year of the fellowship, will be developed as a prototype for a continuing program. The second component addresses the improvement of professional skills by means of a week-long conference designed to explore and describe the frontiers of research librarianship. The objective of the conference is to relate research library development and operations to economic, technological, political, and intellectual factors that promise to dominate policy-making for the next decade. UCLA will receive support for the first of a series of such conferences to be attended by librarians, university administrators, and others from related pertinent fields.

So much for the intentions of the three library schools. Now, where do the ARL librarians come in; what role or roles are they expected to play? Obviously, the ARL libraries are central to the enterprise, and their active involvement is crucial if the PETREL program is to succeed. As some of you will know, that involvement has already begun. Both the Chicago and Michigan Library Schools have established advisory committees of research librarians, most of them from ARL libraries. To provide assistance in ongoing program definition and evaluation, Chicago is working with Bill Budington, John Crerar Library; Beverly Lynch, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle; John McGowan, Northwestern University; Martin Runkle, University of Chicago; Don Simpson, Center for Research Libraries; Bill Towner, Newberry Library; and Julie Virgo, as official observer for the Association of College and Research Libraries of the American Library Association. Beyond its advisory function, this group represents the host libraries for the investigative internships, and they will assist in identifying problems for investigation by the interns. The Michigan Library School has a similar advisory group, as ARL Directors will know from a recent letter sent to them by Russ Bidlack. The Michigan advisory committee is comprised of Dick Chapin, Michigan State University; John McGowan, Northwestern University; Bill Studer, Ohio State University; Joe Dagnese, Purdue University, and Dick Dougherty and Jane Flenner, University of Michigan. Important as these advisory groups are, they should not be viewed as the sole source of advice and assistance to the library schools; on the contrary, the library schools want and need help from all ARL directors and their senior staff people.

With respect to the Chicago program, for example, ARL directors should identify librarians on their staffs who could benefit from the program, encourage them to apply, and provide supporting references. In case there are people who should not apply, too, you should supply candid evaluations of the unworthy candidates, so that the program is not burdened with inadequate people. And, last and most important, directors should provide the most promising candidates with institutional support, in the form of released time and, if possible, full or partial salary. You will soon be receiving from Boyd Rayward, Dean of the Graduate Library School of Chicago, a press release announcing the new program there and soliciting your cooperation. I urge you to give it prompt and thoughtful attention.

Now, let us look at the Michigan program. The help that we, in ARL libraries, can give to that program is much the same as that required at Chicago. First, we should try to help with the recruiting. Michigan is looking for the best and brightest newcomers to the profession; it is prepared to give them an excellent educational experience, with generous fellowship support. This program will obviously benefit from wide publicity, at the outset. Eventually, we will enjoy the opportunity to employ the products of the program, and I am confident that the libraries that do so

will have reason to consider themselves fortunate. But, the present urgency is to get the best prospects into the programs, soon. Michigan's deadline is nearly upon us; they want applications by June 1, if at all possible. So, push your staffs to spread the word. Michigan will also want some help with its internships, but I am assuming that, initially, at least, that help will be forthcoming from the advisory group I mentioned earlier, and from the libraries they represent.

The help we can all give UCLA is even more clear-cut. Candidates for the senior fellows program are already on our staff and have recently assumed major managerial responsibilities. The task is to identify these people, release them from their duties for six weeks, and if at all possible, send them forth with some institutional support. Again, the need is for released time, at the very least; travel funds, full or partial — in short, whatever you can do, to share the financial burden with the Council on Library Resources. Unless institutional support is forthcoming, these programs cannot survive beyond the few years of CLR's likely involvement. Finally, I am sure that Bob Hays at UCLA would want me to urge all of you to think about the first "frontiers" conference which UCLA will host and administer. Your suggestions for participants will be welcome. The need is twofold: for persons who can prepare individual papers on key issues, and for thoughtful librarians, scholars, and administrators to hear and discuss those papers. If the people are good and the chemistry is right, the results can be of lasting value.

I have taken a bit more of your time than I intended, but I hope you will agree with me that PETREL is an important new intiative whose intention is to benefit all research libraries. As befits a McDonald, I will close, by saying, "We do it all for you!"

MR. LUCKER: Thanks, John. Given the amount of time that is elapsed since the PETREL program was set up, what has been achieved is rather remarkable. It is wonderful to hear about these programs starting, and I would urge all of you to provide the kind of support that PETREL needs.

MR. McDONALD: I have an afterthought. It occurs to me that any ARL director from an institution having a library school might also be talking about PETREL, making sure that the school is aware of what is going on. There will be other grants, in other years, and we do hope that the rest of the library schools will see themselves as possible agents for this program.

Report on the ARL Task Force on Library Education

MR. LUCKER: It is quite fitting that we follow up on this report with a report from our own Task Force on Library Education. Margot McBurney, Chair of that Task Force, unfortunately is ill and unable to attend. She has asked Ted Johnson, who is another member of the task force, to report for her.

MR. JOHNSON (Emory University): Thank you, Jay. Not all things are as they seem so I will attempt to be "Margot McBurney," today, bringing you greetings from her. Just a very quick summary of where we are and how we have gotten to this point.

The Task Force was organized and charged by the ARL Board of Directors in October 1979. We were given three tasks: first, to gather opinions and perception of research library directors about the current state of education of our staffs and education for research librarianship. That survey has been conducted and the data assembled and shared with the Board of Directors. Second, we were asked to sponsor a forum or discussion in this body, which we did at the October 1980 meeting. Third, we were instructed to pull together the information from these two exercises and present a report to the Board, which Margot did, in January 1981. At that time, as a part of our report, we identified three kinds of activities we thought needed discussion and development in the future in areas that we would like to target.

The first area we identified is to work on actions that the Association, itself, can take in supporting improvement in education for research librarianship. Secondly, there are a number of things that we, as individual directors, can do, and we believe these activities are as important as anything else. John McDonald has just given you a nice array of those things that we can do, and each of you can do, to support the PETREL program. This coordinates very well with some of the directions the task force is pursuing. Thirdly, we are interested in developing more specific recommendations along lines that we in institutions with library schools can take, together with our teaching colleagues. We encourage you to do what John just added as an afterthought, and that is to begin, those of you in or near institutions with schools of librarianship, to engage your colleagues in those schools, if you are not already talking with them, in exploring together ways that we can improve research library education. We are particularly interested in encouraging joint projects: either teaching, in which we introduce practitioners specifically into the teaching process along with faculty; or, conversely, engaging some of the practitioners or teachers in research projects in our institutions.

The task force came up with six recommendations for the Board; I will list those, very quickly, for you. The first is recruitment, about which we have already spoken. The problem that we sense is recruiting the very talented students, and weeding out people we would not want to recommend for training in a very complex and increasingly difficult area of work. Second, we would like to work together with the library schools on improving the quality of the educational experience for those students in these new programs that we are developing. Third, we would like to foster a meaningful intellectual exchange between the practitioners — that is, ourselves and our staffs — and library school faculty. Fourth, we would like to work on the area of informing university administrators about the needs of research libraries and, particularly, how this relates to education for research library professionals. Our discussions tomorrow, and Barbara Turlington's paper, will help generate support in this regard, but the task force would like, then, to be able to build on that general program work, and suggest the importance of strongly supporting library schools in the various universities in this time of scarcity, ensuring that they are contributing to the profession and particularly to our needs in research libraries. Fifth, we want to increase the opportunity for purposeful, important, and useful internships. And sixth, we are interested in working on development of effective ways to educate and develop mid-career librarians. Again, the PETREL program holds promise in that regard.

We asked the Board for their advice and comments in January on our work and recommended that the task force be continued and charged to develop the areas I

have just outlined. The Board endorsed our report and direction, and charged us to continue.

One other thing we talked about, in general, was the need to begin to open informal communication channels with the Association of American Library Schools. We intend to begin so that we can work together with that group to develop ideas, programs, and recommendations that will be accepted in both communities.

At the task force meeting earlier today, we identified a number of tasks that we will pursue to carry out these basic recommendations. We plan to keep you informed through the ARL Newsletter as we proceed. We are beginning to work on drafting recommendations for internship programs and recommendations for ways that library schools and libraries can work together. We would be most appreciative of ideas and input that any of you have. Please send your comments to the Office, and the staff will send them to the task force members. Also, in the next few months you will receive a questionnaire for the development of a SPEC Kit on internships and recruitment. The task force will be working with Maxine Sitts on the development of the Kit, and we ask for your help. Thank you.

Report of the ARL Committee on Interlibrary Loan

MR. PETERSON (Southern Illinois University): There are three items that I will report on for the Interlibrary Loan Committee. First, the status of the Copyright Act review. You may remember from our meeting a year ago at Salt Lake City that the Interlibrary Loan Committee had considered whether ARL should testify at the hearings that were being conducted by the Copyright Office, and it was decided at that time, that, in light of the facts that we had not collected data from ARL libraries and that the burden of proof of any problems involved in the copyright revisions was really upon the publishers, it would be premature to submit testimony. In the meantime, the Copyright Office has contracted with King Research, Inc. to conduct a study among librarians, publishers, and users for the review. The first set of questionnaires has been distributed to a selected group of libraries and the results are being tabulated. Questionnaires for the publishers and users have not yet been distributed.

It is still the belief of the ILL Committee that ARL should probably maintain a low profile with regard to the Copyright Act review until the King Research study is completed and we have firm data upon which to base our replies. Meanwhile, in some enquiries that have been made by members of the committee, we have discovered to date, that, although the copyright regulations have added somewhat to the paperwork and the mechanics of compliance, there have been no major problems for the ARL libraries. We feel that the problems probably have been felt more by smaller libraries and special libraries, both groups which have already testified in some of the hearings. We will be continuing to keep in contact with Council of National Library and Information Associations Ad Hoc Committee on Copyright with regard to the progress of the King Research study. And, if there are any concerns that members of ARL libraries have about the copyright situation, the regulations, or any proposals that might come forth for further revision of the Act, we certainly will be ready to respond to them on behalf of the Association.

Second, just a word about the revised interlibrary loan code. You will remember that the committee recommended at the ARL Meeting in Salt Lake City that we support the adoption of the code. The code was presented to ALA in June 1980 and was adopted. In our enquiries about the reactions to the code, we have not found major problems. In fact, there has been a general feeling that the new code has facilitated interlibrary loans. If any member institution feels that this has not been the case, we would like to hear from you.

The third item is that the ALA RASD Interlibrary Loan Committee is working with Virginia Boucher, from the University of Colorado, who has a contract with the American Library Association for the issuing of a manual for interlibrary loan. Miss Boucher has written the first two chapters of that manual; copies of it were circulated to members of the RASD committee back in February and have been returned to her. We hope that, during the next six months to a year, Miss Boucher will be able to complete the remaining chapters. ALA will then publish the manual.

If there are any questions that anyone would like to ask about the work of the ILL Committee, I will be certainly glad to respond to them.

MR. McDONALD: I do not know whether I have a question or a comment. I believe that the King study will produce some information. I have a feeling, though, that the questionnaire used as a data gathering instrument is not all that friendly to our cause, and that the information elicited may require rebuttal by this Association. I would just urge the committee to be alert and be ready to man the battlements, when the time comes. You know me — I am a diehard! But, we were one of the libraries which received the questionnaire, and I found a good many problems with it. I do not know whether others did or not.

MR. PETERSON: We were one of the libraries, also, John, that received a copy of the questionnaire, and although we were concerned about it, we think that the difficulties in the questionnaire will not really work against our libraries, but will cause as many problems for the people trying to propose further restrictions. We have been anxious to receive copies of the proposed questionnaires for publishers and users; we want to review those carefully. We believe that the burden of proof is going to be with the publishers to show cause where they have been damaged by interlibrary loan and copyright procedures that have been followed. We believe that, at this point, if we were to make very much noise or try to mobilize arguments, we might be feeding more into counterarguments by the publishers -- the very kinds of things for which they and their attorneys may be looking. By remaining quiet, the burden of building the case is going to be upon them. When we see how they show their hand, then we feel that we should be ready for the attack.

Admission of New Members

MR. LUCKER: In May 1980, the Membership approved a new set of guidelines for invitations to new members of the Association. For university libraries the criteria provide for a mathematical test against the institution's statistics. If an institution satisfies the conditions in the membership criteria, its name is to be brought before the Membership for approval of an invitation to become a member. There are now two institutions who have asked consideration for membership; their

statistics have been received, evaluated, and checked by the experts we have available, against the statistics for the Association. And, therefore, I am pleased, on behalf of the Board, to request Membership approval to invite the University of Manitoba and the University of California at Irvine to join the Association. As this is a motion from the Board, it requires no second. Are there any questions or comments about this? Hearing none, I will call for a vote from the Membership. According to the Bylaws, this vote requires a majority of the members present, assuming that we have a quorum present -- which we do -- 50 percent of the members. All those in favor, please signify by saying "aye." Anybody opposed? The motion carries. We will extend an invitation to those two institutions. I am pleased to report that, in anticipation of a favorable response, I took it upon myself to extend an invitation to the directors of those two libraries to attend this meeting. Thus, I would like to introduce two soon-to-be-colleagues of the Association. From the University of California at Irvine, Calvin Boyer; from the University of Manitoba, Marilyn Sharrow.

Report of the ARL Federal Relations Committee

MR. LUCKER: The next report is from the Federal Relations Committee. This is one of the new committees that ARL has organized this year, and it is being chaired by Carlton Rochell of New York University.

MR. ROCHELL (New York University): Of all the committees one might not want to chair at this particular moment, it might be Federal Relations. If you are a conservative politician, this seems to be the best of times; if you are a Federal Relations chairman, it is the worst of times. Although Ralph covered a number of items concerning federal relations, I would like to comment on some of these from my own perspective.

We need to be aware that there is a real, fundamental shift going on that involves not only government officials but the citizenship of this country as well. It is fairly accurate to say that those legislators we once termed "liberal" are now "moderate," and those that we once termed "moderate" are now "conservative," and those we once termed "conservative" are falling off the right side of the continuum. The result of this is that a number of the programs that many of us have worked on, some of them since the 1950's, concerning higher education and libraries, social programs, cultural institutions, etc., are all beleaguered, to say the least. So, it is an appropriate time for this organization to institute a Federal Relations Committee. We had our first meeting yesterday, but we have been at work over the past few months, as you have no doubt guessed. One thing I did want to mention is the questionnaire that all of you received last February in the name of the committee. We have tabulated the returns, and we now have at least 72 of you who have indicated a willingness to work with us. We have you matched up with home and library district legislators as well as with the contacts and friends in various federal offices in Washington that you mentioned on the questionnaire. The effectiveness of this sytem will continue to be tested over the coming months. As we call on you, it will be in specific areas, in specific subcommittees, and for specific assignments. I hope that you will make it your business to keep up, as well as you can, on what is going on in general with these programs. Since Ralph has already reviewed several of them for you, I will hit only a couple of high spots.

As I am speaking at this moment, I understand that the House is voting on a version of the budget that has the support of the President, known as "Gramm/Latta." If this version is adopted, as it is expected to be, the cuts to educational programs will total substantially more than the $11 billion cut suggested in the original Reagan budget. A version of the budget that called for $1.8 million cuts in education was defeated yesterday. As it now stands, it looks like overall, categorical assistance programs for all types of libraries will be cut in excess of 25 percent by the current appropriations. And the most devastating part of this, I think, is that this is really the first year of a three-year budget-balancing act, which means that whatever is determined for this coming year will probably be the maximum expected under any of these programs for the coming three years. Once these general ceiling levels are set, authorized levels for each program will be revised prior to May 15.

One of the really alarming activities going on at this point concerns authorization levels, which are set by the Congress. There is an attempt being made by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) — and it looks like it will probably be successful — to have the appropriations level that is set for the year that we are presently in become the authorization levels for the next three years. We have here a peculiar case of what appears to me to be the executive getting involved in the legislative function. All these programs in education are included in an overall package called "Function 500." This function also includes various social programs, public service jobs, such as the CETA program, etc. So, for those of you who benefit from these programs, there is going to be at least four billion dollars more cut in Function 500 than we had thought just a few days ago.

As you know, Title II-C of the Higher Education Act (HEA) is still set at the 1981 level of $6 million. Regarding the elimination of Title II-A, it is particularly unfortunate that we are losing, at this time, a part of HEA that has made it possible for many of the smaller college libraries to not only continue to buy books but to participate in cooperative activities and, indeed, to take some of the interlibrary loan strain off many of the libraries that are represented here today. To the extent possible, I hope that we will continue to keep our forces as a profession in as harmonious a posture as we can related to all types of legislation affecting all types of libraries.

I would just give you one example of the 138 percent postal rate increase that Ralph mentioned: a two-pound parcel, mailed in 1970 for seven cents, on October 1, 1981 will cost 67 cents.

The situation of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC), which Ralph described, is summed up in the following quote: it would return to "the status it held in the 1950's, as an advisory body providing documentary works and assisting institutions in finding funds." Now, the awful irony of that is, of course, that there will be no place left to find funds, so this entire program is directly jeopardized. A complicating factor is that the grant function of NHPRC is up for reauthorization at the same time. On April 2, the House Government Operations Committee Chairman, Jack Brooks, introduced a bill to extend NHPRC grant authorization for two years at a level of three million dollars a year. Hearings were held last week. If a report by the subcommittee, along with a budget-impact statement, is not issued by May 15, however, future projects funded by NHPRC will be tossed onto the growing funeral pyre of those already mentioned.

In terms of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), the situation is, as Ralph has said, fairly well known. It is going to be very drastically affected. At this point, it looks to be a 50 percent reduction in the Challenge Grant area, and research collection programs, public programs — many of those will disappear entirely; some of them will be cut back, very severely.

MS. CHILD (National Endowment for the Humanities): The Research Resources Program has been cut one-third, but we will have three million dollars next year. Please, don't write me off too soon!

MR. ROCHELL: At present, the most effective way we seem to have of convincing Congress to support programs is by letter campaigns and by detailed, cogent presentations before various subcommittees. Although things are gloomy, there is still some hope, and those of you who are interested in the NEH and other programs and have been writing and speaking to Congressmen should keep on doing so.

Finally, I would like to just say that, in the meeting that the Federal Relations Committee had yesterday — and my fellow committeemen are Charles Churchwell, Richard Dougherty, Roger Hanson, Russell Shank, and George Shipman — we really spent some time talking about what a committee such as this does when the world is falling down around us. It is clear, at this time, that this Association and others of like interest are going to have to remain extremely visible, extremely vocal, and extremely active in enunciating our priorities for both long- and short-term goals. It is equally clear to the committee that we are not going to be able to do this alone and, over the coming weeks and months, it is our intention to work with Shirley and the staff and many of you, to cement links with other organizations, associations in the higher education community, in the other elements of the library community and, specifically, to work and enlist the direct support of such organizations as ACRL, to mobilize our collective efforts and work towards common goals.

We feel that, based on our short time at work here, although the staff of ARL has been extremely helpful and responsive, we really need a firm level of commitment by someone who spends as much as 50 percent of his or her time on legislative/federal relations matters. This ought not be something that someone picks up when they do not have another crisis before them, but an expected part of their daily, weekly, and monthly lives. I do intend, in the next couple of weeks, to have a conversation with Shirley about our ideas regarding the whole legislative/federal relations enterprise, and certainly she will be reporting back to the Board on our recommendations concerning that area.

I would like to conclude by thanking Ralph McCoy, who not only worked with several of us in getting this Federal Relations Committee established, but who has personally worked with us in getting it off the ground and moving in the right direction. As all of us know, he spent a great deal of his time over the last several weeks and months dealing with the matters I have just touched on. So, our thanks to you, Ralph.

MR. LUCKER: Questions or comments?

MR. FORTH (Pennsylvania State University): I have some real concerns -- and, if you will, I am more confused than usual. There are a great many federal programs that the Establishment is interested in. Mr. McCoy ticked off some of them; Carlton has just ticked off some of them. And I am finding with my own university administration that they are taking the approach of flatly refusing to support or endorse very many of these programs, They want me to tell them what is most important to the library at the Pennsylvania State University. It has been my experience with them, and with the Vice President for Academic Affairs of two other institutions with whom I have recently had brief discussions, that the university administrators, beyond our level, are primarily concerned with the problems of student aid, work/study, NSF money, NIH money, etc. These things loom much larger on their list of priorities than do ours. My administration has made it very clear that they are willing to back only the two or three issues we consider of highest priority. And I have said, "Okay. The Library of Congress -- whenever they call for help on appropriations for the Library of Congress, I want us to deliver." And, they have agreed. Another major issue is postage, which, of course, is to their benefit, too. The third is work/study.

But, when my administration has asked me, over umpteen years, how much Title II-A money have we received, their point is: it is not really worth using our limited influence there; we do not want to waste it on that issue -- certainly not on Title II-B. And, after our bitter experience with II-C, my university will not lift a hand for that program. My own wish would be that ARL would select the programs that they are most interested in, and push those. Because if we try and spread ourselves over the whole spectrum of programs, including the National Endowments, so we can have a street theater and this kind of thing and the people are not prepared to give equal support to all of these programs, than I believe we must get our act together and be selective. Sorry if you do not like it, Carlton.

MR. ROCHELL: We discussed this issue, from one perspective yesterday, and that is that some directors of ARL libraries are freer than others to do specific lobbying activities related to federal programs. Indeed, one of the very things that I was alluding to a while ago was not only the establishment of current priorities in terms of this Association but also to start to look at future legislative initiatives that we might want the Association to undertake. Certainly we will be looking over all that in the coming year or so.

But, in terms of what you are saying, I believe there is both a realistic position and, if you will, a political position. From one side, it is important that this Association be on record as supporting library legislation that has received the support of the American Library Association, the Medical Library Association, etc., and that we appear to have common cause, in terms of a legislative package related to all types of libraries. Quite naturally, we are going to end up working harder, in many cases, for things that interest us most directly. But, we have seen the results, at least once with the National Periodical Center, of the profession itself splintering into two segments on an issue. The totality of the library profession and the institutions and services we represent is, relatively speaking, fairly small and not very strong. So what we want to do is work to a position where we know what we want to support most strongly. But, we are also working in a network that includes the whole profession and the higher education community, people who can and will, we believe, support the programs that we are most interested in. So, I think we can have it both ways, if you will, Stu.

MR. FORTH: Yes. I can write, as an individual, to anybody I want, identifying myself as a university librarian — and, indeed, I do so. But my concern is if every time something comes along, ARL makes a strong response, "You have got to have this, too," we are going to blow our credibility in the present climate in Washington.

MR. ROCHELL: I do not think we are in any danger, right at the moment, of saying too much.

MR. FORTH: Yes. Of course, we have never got very much, either.

MR. LUCKER: The National Endowment for the Humanities was mentioned a couple of times, and it is not quite clear what the facts are. Also, there are two National Endowments, one that does the street theater, and one that does not. The one that does not is the one we are most concerned with; I thought maybe Margaret Child would like to say at least a few words about it.

MS. CHILD: I think I have just done you all a favor. Actually, it may be the most gripping thing you are going to hear, today. First of all, as I am sure most of you are aware, there are two Endowments, and we are the one that does not do street theatre — except when I get very upset!

These 50 percent cuts that have been heralded in the press for the last several weeks are having a very unfortunate effect to some extent, because many people throughout the country are more or less writing off the Endowments. That is one reason for the violence of my reaction at this moment, because I have a deadline coming up the first of June, and it is very clear that the level of enquiries is way down. Usually, at this time, three weeks before the deadline, everybody says, "My God, their deadline is the first of June," and they call and ask for an extension. That is not happening this year, and I wanted to make sure that everybody understands that, although the agency is being cut 50 percent, the Research Resources Program — we have changed our name, we do this to keep everybody alert — is only being cut one-third and, in real money, we will have $3 million next year. Now, that is only half as much as Title II-C, but $3 million is not an inconsiderable sum, and we would still like to see a number of very strong applications.

I sympathize, however, with Mr. Forth's dilemma with his college administration, and I do hope that one of the things that perhaps this Federal Relations Committee that you have set up could do is to begin to look very critically at the kinds of funding available just for libraries, and go through the kind of analysis that NEH has been going through, internally, over the last several months. We have tried to save those program lines, or cut them less severely, where we feel that federal funding is absolutely necessary. We believe that there are certain things that will not happen unless there is an infusion of federal money. Many federal programs make life pleasanter, easier, a little bit more colorful, etc. But, there are certain activities that, basically, will just not continue unless there are some federal dollars, at least to lever the beginning of some movement out in individual institutions or in networks. I would hope very much that this is part of the consideration you are giving, when you are looking to determine which programs you are going to make the strongest case to save, because I personally believe that the attack is just beginning. The little notice in today's New York Times that the heads of task forces have been appointed to look at the future of both

Endowments, with a mandate from President Reagan to consider the viability of making both Endowments public corporations on the model of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting would, if that happened to the National Endowment for the Humanities, very dramatically change the character of what we do, as well as the dollar figures involved.

That is something to start thinking about, now.

MR. LUCKER: Ralph, do you want to make a comment?

MR. McCOY: I think we have been doing this last year precisely what you recommend, Stuart. We have been working closely with the ALA on the total library programs, and we have testified at oversight hearings on those total programs. But, we have an understanding with the ALA Washington Office; we have been zeroing in on those programs that have precise and important implication for research libraries. For example, we have given our first priority to the Library of Congress budget. We have told the Membership what the situation was, and then we have gone to the individual members so they could write to their representatives in Congress. We gave special preference to NEH particularly, because we were concerned with the preservation program which had come under particular attack. We also gave special attention to the NHPRC, because almost every one of the 40 publications projects related to a library in our Membership.

Now, while we were all favorable to Title II-C and would like to see that stay at the $6 million this year, we sort of laid low on this, because it was already in the President's budget so there was no reason, at least at this time, for us to agitate for something that is already likely to go through. A little later on, when it comes to the appropriations stage, if there is some question whether the $6 million will be approved, then it will be time for us to agitate. But right now, we are keeping quiet; we think it will go through without any agitation. And, of course, we did put special effort on the Artists' and Writers' Tax Equity — that is a new bill, and does not involve the budget — because we knew that all of our members were concerned with that.

So, I think we have done both: we have tied in with the American Library Association for a broad support of all library programs, but have zeroed in on those four or five programs that will affect research libraries directly.

Report on the Production Guidelines for Book Longevity Committee

MR. STAM (New York Public Library): I am struck with the number of these reports which ask you to do something. I hope you all have deputies at home to run your libraries so you are free to do your full-time job of writing letters, filling in questionnaires, advising committees, etc. I am also struck that Professor Rudenstine suggested this morning that we could put pressure and high visibility on the publishers on the question of the costs of journals, and that, this afternoon, we saw a low profile on the question of copyrights, etc. I now come to ask for high visibility with the publishers on the question of the shoddy products that they are giving to us.

For the past two years, I have served as your representative to a committee formed in 1979 by the Mellon Foundation and Council on Library Resources that is concerned with imperative preservation problems that the books we are buying present to us now and will present in the future. The committee is called the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity — I have heard worse! Our purpose has been to increase the awareness of publishers and, especially their production managers, of the longer-term implications of the quality of the papers they choose for their hardbound books. The committee is a small one, but it includes publishers, librarians, and representatives of the paper industry. After it had completed the third draft of its report, the Center for the Book at the Library of Congress hosted a conference on this subject, with wide representation from those three groups. A report on that conference appeared in the LC Information Bulletin of March 27, 1981. The Committee has now completed its report on book paper and, although I am unable to distribute the copies here — I do not have them yet — we do expect that the entire report will be published soon in Publishers Weekly.* CLR will distribute the report, too, to an extensive mailing list, including ARL directors, and will provide copies to anyone expressing an interest in it.

What the committee and report have attempted is a description of the problems created by acidic paper and, in effect, to push that problem back from the library and librarians to the original producer. We have discussed the state of the paper industry, discovered that acid-free paper need not be more expensive than acidic paper of the quality normally used in hardbound books, and have tentatively suggested some types of books for which longevity is particularly important to us. Finally, in the report is an important appendix for the publishers themselves. We have developed a set of technical guidelines for book longevity. We want to direct substantial attention to the problem and, ultimately, the person we have to reach is the production manager in the publisher's office — the person responsible for selecting the paper going into the book.

We think that librarians in general, and you in particular, can help. Although we found that the quality of paper used in university press books is far above industry standards, it certainly would be helpful for you to share and discuss our report with university press directors, and ask them to spread the word further among their counterparts with whom they must deal. University conservators or others responsible for the physical maintenance of collections can also let publishers know of your own or their reactions to shoddy book publications. With letters to those publishers, you might include copies of these guidelines that we have developed. You might also find that your local or campus newspapers will find the issue newsworthy.

The second group with which you could help is authors on your campuses or among your constituencies. Herbert Bailey, the Director of the Princeton University Press, likes to tell a story about talking to John McPhee, and his shock and horror at the fate that Herb described to him of what was likely to happen to his works due to the harmful production standards. Many of your own authors on campus publish with trade book houses and, in contract negotiations, could sometimes insist on physical specifications which would be important to a book's longevity. I think we will all benefit from whatever help you can give to increasing the awareness of the problem.

*"Making books that last," Publishers Weekly, vol. 219, no. 22, May 29, 1981, p. 19-22.

Finally, I should say that the committee, having produced this report, will next tackle the question of binding structures and longevity, and you can expect another report from me, probably in about two years. Thank you.

Report of the ARL/CRL Committee on Expanded Access to Journal Collections

MR. SCHMIDT (Brown University): No visibility problems, here! I will not follow David Stam by asking for low visibility on this issue. The Joint Committee, as you know, was created as a successor body -- a fourth incarnation, as near as my archives can tell me -- of an attempt to address the problems of access to the journal literature. The members of the Committee are myself, John McDonald, Donald Koepp, Susan Brynteson, Richard Talbot, Richard Chapin, and Elaine Sloan. We met for the first time during the ALA Midwinter Meeting in Washington, and we will meet again tomorrow morning.

Many of the members of ARL are also members of the Center for Research Libraries and, in the materials you received for the annual meeting of CRL, last Friday, you will find a description of a three-phased program for the Center's efforts to improve access to journal literature. Those of you who are not members of the Center can contact me, and I will be happy to reproduce the report for you. The first phase is an internal phase, wherein the Center is attempting to examine the journals for which it is requesting copies from the British Library Lending Division. CRL Director Donald Simpson and his staff have discovered that for a number of journals the frequency of demand brings the price of a subscription equal to the cost of borrowing it. They will begin this year to shift funds from the line in their budget for BLLD to local subscriptions, selecting those titles for which purchase is a more cost-effective method for providing access. The later phases of the program will be of most direct interest to this Membership, as well as to the Center's Membership. The development of those phases will evolve through interaction with this Joint Committee.

The immediate projects we are planning are to conduct, with your help, a survey of the kind we have discussed at the October meeting, and to also begin to discover ways of identifying, specifically, which titles are those that represent the much-talked-about "most-heavily-requested items." There are a number of lists around that must be examined and synthesized in order to compile a list of specific titles that could represent a part of Phases Two and Three. I might report, at this point, that, to the extent that this undertaking occurs, it is clear that it will need an infusion of capital beyond the resources of any existing organization, including the Center. Also, the accumulation of back files of appropriate length to make the enterprise most viable could most economically come through the cooperation of libraries such as those represented here, who might deposit some of their back files.

Report of the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control

MR. GOVAN (University of North Carolina): I am here at the request of Joseph Howard of the Library of Congress, who asked the task force, at its meeting

today, to call to your attention something you may already have seen and, indeed, to ask you to write yet another letter. It has to do with the relationships between the Library of Congress and the GPO, and the shift in balance of publication from hard-copy to microform. Because of the budgetary pressures that we have been hearing about all afternoon, there is a strong indication that there is going to be an increased number of government publications issued in microform. This has a number of implications for each of our libraries, from preservation to space to organizational problems, and LC is very interested in our responses to several specific questions. First, do you classify monographic government publications, and second, what would be the impact on your library if the LC classification number were no longer adding to the records of the approximately 3000 monographs from GPO that LC catalogs. If LC has to choose between continuing to catalog that same number but doing a less-full description, would that be preferable to having a full description on a fewer number of monographs? The Library would also like some sense of your feeling about the possibility of having all government documents in microform.

Report of the ARL President

MR. LUCKER: I have spent a very interesting six months as President of this Association. First of all, I want to thank the staff and the Board of Directors and, also, every director of an ARL library, because you have been very helpful. I have had a lot of communications and many interesting discussions and, whenever I have asked for support and assistance, I have received it. I will report first on the Board meeting that has just taken place over the past few days.

The Board approved the following statement, coordinated with the Library of Congress and with other organizations, regarding ISBD and AACR 2:

> With the adoption of AACR 2, in January 1981, the North American library community has been using ISBD. Changing to AACR 2 (including the ISBD) has been an expensive proposition and libraries will be recovering from this experience for several years. While the 113 libraries making up the Association of Research Libraries are in support of international standards and the idea of Universal Bibliographic Control, many are experiencing severe budget cutbacks and are extremely concerned over budgetary impacts when it comes to the changing of cataloging rules. Therefore, the Association of Research Libraries requests that the IFLA Committee on Cataloging be aware of these concerns and that a conservative attitude be taken towards any possible additions or changes to the ISBD in the revision process.

Another action the Board took was to approve the submission of a grant proposal to implement the recommendations of the ARL Microform Project. The proposal will be submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities; we have already received a commitment from the Council on Library Resources of $20,000. The purpose of the funds will be to hire a part-time coordinator to carry out the recommendations that the Board and the Membership agreed were the most important from the project's report. I will read briefly from the proposal:

The assignment of the coordinator will include: 1) encouraging microform publishers to provide cataloging to bibliographic utilities; 2) working with publishers and utilities to negotiate contracts that ensure that standards are met and records are available without restrictions; 3) organizing and coordinating cooperative cataloging and conversion projects for microform collections by both ARL and non-ARL libraries. The coordination of projects is needed to help libraries determine which sets to catalog, allocate assignments, and negotiate standards. Once agreements are working and projects are well under way, the special coordinator's task will be completed.

We have great hopes that this proposal will be funded. It is a very important follow-up to a long and difficult study, and I am very pleased that we are able to move ahead. As soon as we have some indication that funding will be forthcoming, we will begin recruiting for the position of coordinator.

In another action, the Board approved ARL participation in a joint project with the National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services. The proposed project is to develop a mechanism whereby information regarding the abstracting and indexing of particular titles can be added to the CONSER database and to include coverage in the CONSER database of all the serial titles abstracted or indexed by the major abstracting and indexing services in this country. The first stage will be to develop a plan with a consultant; there will be a joint ARL/NFAIS committee working with the consultant. Once the plan has been developed, we will have to seek funding for the program. The objective, of course, is to provide libraries with more extensive information online for serial records to help with acquisition and de-acquisition decisions and with reference service. The records will also indicate which of the abstracting and indexing services actually provide the delivery systems. Part of the planning will be to see whether information such as the existence of the file in the Center for Research Libraries or in the Universal Serials and Book Exchange is also feasible. Another aspect will be to look at the question of including information in the database about the indexing and abstracting in online databases that have no printed counterpart. At this stage, however, all the Board has approved is that there be a joint effort to develop a proposal and to seek funding for a major grant. We will keep the Membership informed as the project develops.

Another major item of discussion was the Foreign Acquisitions Newsletter, which most of you may have forgotten about since it has not appeared in quite a while. The Board has been discussing, over the past year, the question of the continuation of this newsletter. It represents a net cost to the Association of approximately $5,000 per year — not a lot of money, but given our other concerns, an amount to consider. A brief readership survey to determine the use of FAN by the library community and its importance to the Association did not cover these economic questions. Therefore, the Board proposed that another study be undertaken, which will very deliberately set about to find out three things: 1) do ARL libraries feel this is a justifiable expense for ARL to undertake from general Association funds; 2) if not, how many libraries would be willing to support the cost of the publication by subscribing to it, and, 3) of the non-ARL subscribers — of which there are about 185 — how many would continue to subscribe if the price were increased from the present $10.00 per year to $30-50 per year, which represents the real costs of production? So, if you are tired of writing letters, you will probably just have to answer a questionnaire!

There were two reports made to the Board for information, and I will just summarize them. Again, these are long documents but they report on two activities of great interest.

The first is an effort by the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the Council on Library Resources, with the cooperation of ARL, to begin developing some plans for cooperative activities regarding research libraries. As you know, the AAU has identified libraries and library supporters as a major focus of their efforts in the coming years, and the first move in this direction was to set up a small planning group consisting of several university presidents, four directors from ARL libraries — Jim Govan, Pat Battin, Bill Welsh, and myself — and representatives from several foundations and from the AAU and CLR. The purpose was to develop a mechanism whereby we could start to bring together librarians, university administrators, and scholars to address research library topics. It was agreed to set up several task forces to develop a series of position papers, with the first outcome to bring together, some time within the next year, a meeting of university administrators, association and organization people, scholars, and librarians to see what can be done to work together to start to promote the cause of research libraries. This, you will recall, is one of the recommendations in Scholarly Communication: the Report of the National Enquiry; it also appears in the set of recommendations from the AAU Research Universities Project.

The second effort of which you should be aware — and there was an article about it in the April 27 issue of the ARL Newsletter — is the work of the Council on Library Resources and the Carnegie Corporation to interest corporate foundations in the support of research libraries. The first step was the production of a brochure describing, in a sense, two things. First, the strong relationship of research libraries to corporations in the area of support, the whole idea of research and development and its dependence upon our collections; and, second, an attempt to interest corporations in supporting research libraries. The response to the Council has been good. At least 75 corporate foundations have expressed an interest in further information, with several indicating a willingness to participate in some sort of program. The Council and the Carnegie Foundation are proceeding to try to bring together interested foundations and libraries. ARL is directly involved in working with the Council, especially in one particular area: the possibility of setting up in ARL a fund, supported by corporate foundations, to provide support for research library programs.

The Board also discussed plans for the next two meetings of the Association. We will meet in October 1981 in Washington, D.C., and in May 1982 in Scottsdale, Arizona. For those of you who are not historians of the Association, I will remind you that 1982 is the fiftieth anniversary year of ARL, and the May 1982 meeting is the one-hundredth meeting of the Association. The Board believes it would be desirable and useful to have a special program to commemorate this event, and if any of you have suggestions about topics, speakers, or format for the May 1982 meeting, we would very much like to hear those suggestions. They can be made to the staff, to Penny Abell, who is the incoming President, or to me.

During the year, the Board and the Executive Committee have had a number of other discussions regarding Association operations. I would like to just talk about three areas: committee policy, meeting sites, and the budget.

First, committee policy. We took a very hard look at the question of committee structure, organization, and membership. I received a number of suggestions and comments from people who felt that there should be wider participation in the committees of the Association. Some sensed that the same people kept turning up on committee lists. After due deliberation, the Executive Committee — since the Executive Committee and the President are responsible for committee assignments — agreed to establish a policy that, whevever possible, no director be appointed to more than one standing committee or major task force. And, while some circumstances require special expertise making it necessary to appoint non-directors, insofar as possible, task forces and committees should be comprised of ARL directors. This will promote more participation in the Association and, incidentally, result in some financial savings, as the Association has to pick up the tab when non-directors must come to ARL meetings to attend committee meetings. Thus, we have tried very hard in this year's appointments to put people on committees who have not been on committees and to reduce responsibilities for people who have more than one committee assignment.

Within the last year or so, we have established a number of new committees, and you have seen some of the results today. The Federal Relations Committee, with Carlton Rochell as chair, and the Collection Development Task Force that Joe Treyz is chairing have both had their first meetings. We now have a Membership Committee on Nonacademic Libraries, as mandated by the membership criteria adopted last May, which has also had its first meeting. And, as you have heard, the ACRL/CRL Joint Committee on Expanded Access to Journal Collections has been hard at work.

Now, in answer to the unasked question about what do you do in the other direction, we are trying to take a hard look at all the committees. One of the principal areas that the Collection Development Task Force is working on this year is to investigate the area studies committees. As you probably know, we have about ten small committees responsible for policy and discussion in various areas. It has not been clear to the Board or to the Executive Committee what the present role and function of these committees are. It is also true they do not cost us very much, because they tend to meet at their learned society meetings rather than at ARL meetings. But, as part of its mandate from the Board, the Collection Development Task Force is looking at the question of the continuation of these committees or another format to take their place.

During the year, as some of you will recall, we raised the question about meeting sites. A group of directors suggested that ARL consider meeting abroad, particularly in England, and possibly for the October 1982 meeting because it would be the fiftieth-anniversary year. Unfortunately, our commitment to Washington precluded proceeding along those lines. However, we did ask people to respond to the suggestion that there be a meeting in Oxford or Cambridge with our counterparts abroad. We did not get an overwhelming response, in terms of numbers, and opinions were definitely mixed. In addition to the ten librarians who recommended the meeting, there were about five letters of support; there were also five letters that raised serious questions and reservations about such a meeting, with concerns over such things as image, financial problems, timing, and so on. The Board, essentially, has come to the position of "no position," on the grounds that, while it is conceivable that a majority of the Membership might, if formally polled, prefer or support this concept, there appears to be a substantial number of

individual directors who feel very strongly that it would be a poor decision, and that there were many who would not be able to attend. The concern of the Board is that, even if we were to adhere to the wishes of the majority, we might, by scheduling a meeting abroad, disenfranchise a significant number of directors.

We have tried on a domestic level to reduce the cost as much as we can to participants, generally agreeing, at least as far as current policy is concerned, to alternate meetings between the east coast and the west coast. For the next few years, we will be having the October meetings in the East and the May meetings in the Midwest, Southwest, or Far West. Also, the Board discussed and agreed that it would be desirable and might even be psychologically beneficial to get out of Washington once in a while. Therefore, we have been looking at the possibility of meeting elsewhere on the east coast in October. The first manifestation of that policy is the meeting scheduled for October 1983 in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. We also have scheduled the May 1984 meeting in Colorado Springs at the Broadmoor.

One other issue on meetings has come up. It was suggested by a number of people that we consider holding only a single meeting a year, on the ground that this would reduce the cost to member directors substantially. The staff and the Board undertook a study of this possibility. We have some concern about it, in a number of areas; although we are cognizant of the fact that this is a major cost in a library's travel budget, we believe there are a number of problems with a single meeting a year. The first would be the reduced participation by members in the affairs of the Association. The second would be the need for an additional Board meeting, in between Membership meetings. A third would be a need for committee meetings that take place while the Association meets, in one of those two times. In terms of the Association's costs, while we would save approximately $9,000 by eliminating one meeting per year, we would substantially add to the Association's budget, given the cost of travel, inflation, etc., if separate Board and committee meetings were held. We would increase the Association's costs at today's rates by at least $20,000 per year, approximately $16,000 more than planned in this year's budget.

We will continue, of course, to find ways to make the running of the Association more economical and reasonable. Let me go on, then, to the final item on my agenda, the ARL budget. As you know, last year, the Board sprung on the Membership a request for a dues increase in a rather hurried and ill-prepared manner. Part of the problem was that we failed to adhere to the ByLaws requirement of prior notification, which created a rather difficult and unnecessary situation. It was my interpretation, after hearing from the members of the Association and from letters, that you would like more information about the Association's finances; you would like to have more advanced notice on the possible effect of the financial situation on dues, and as much information as you can get about the general fiscal situation. We have sent you, with the call to this meeting, an audited financial statement. Unfortunately, due to the auditors' schedule, it came in very late, and we were unable to do any comparative studies with previous years. In addition, the new Executive Director has some very strong ideas about how the budget and the financial statement ought to be prepared, but having only been here three days has not yet had time to act on these ideas.

There are some severe pressures on the Association's budget, as there are on your budgets, and I do not think I am telling you anything you do not know when I recount what they are. There has been increased committee activity — not only the

number of committees but, as you heard from today's presentations, more activity and more need to cooperate with other organizations, resulting in more travel, more clerical work, more postage, etc. Travel costs, I do not need to tell you, are going up. We are trying to economize as well as we can, but inflation, in almost everything, affects the Association. We did make a decision, three years ago, upon the advice of our auditors, to reduce the fund balances which were, for a nonprofit organization, getting somewhat large. But, we have reached the end of that possibility, and now have to start keeping the fund balance at a reasonable level. In other words, for two or three years, we actually used the fund balances to subsidize the dues and, therefore, they did not rise as fast as they might have.

Now, the ARL budget does not work quite the way your library budgets do because we need to be much more closely linked to the activities. Normally, the budget preparation takes place over the summer, after the May meeting, when the Membership has had an opportunity to endorse or reject planned activities. We have already heard from Carlton Rochell; he would like to have some staff support on federal legislation. And, more of the committees keep asking for things that the Board has to consider. Normally, the budget is put together during the summer, and submitted to the Board in October, so that we know what the priorities are and what our experience has been during the year. The ARL budget cycle does not appear to coincide with anybody else's budget cycle; there appear to be at least 73 different budget cycles and at least nine fiscal years among the ARL libraries. In addition, ARL's process normally is six months slower in making its assessment than you need to be in making your budget requests.

In trying to be responsive to your requests for more advanced information on what the prospects are for our dues for next year, we have tried to identify some of the budget issues and to give you some idea of what the Board believes, at the moment, is the prognosis for Association fiscal affairs. And, the issues that we could identify as being most concerned are the ones of same concern to all directors: salaries and keeping pace with the pressures of inflation. Last year we had a salary pool for the staff of 10 percent, which was below the level of inflation. It was also similar to the pool in many ARL libraries. We would hope to keep the salary pool somewhere in that range for the year ahead. The Board continues to be concerned about staff salaries and benefits. We continue to monitor salary ranges in conjunction with other comparable institutions, and the new Executive Director has expressed a particular interest in reviewing this whole area again. There are new programs that put pressure on the Association. Whenever possible, we try to seek outside funding, as in the case of the Microform Project, but inevitably, new programs, even if they bring money with them, put pressure on the Association and the staff; the permanent staff is nearly stretched to the breaking-point. Every time we add a program, even if it brings money with it, we put a greater burden on continuing staff to the point where merely receiving recompense for overhead does not relieve us of the problem of finding sufficient numbers of people to do what needs to be done. I can say, however, that despite increasing activities, there has been no increase in personnel paid out of general Association funds. As far back as I can find, certainly for the last five years, we have not added any professional or support staff on general funds. There is also the question of increased activity with the government, with the AAU, with the Council, all of which costs money. Finally, as you heard this morning, the Board believes, in agreement with the OMS Advisory Committee, it is essential that the level of ARL support to OMS should be increased gradually over the next few years, so the OMS can provide the services that the Membership wants.

Therefore, putting all this together at this point — and, I confess to a certain lack of ability to see very far in the future — the best view of the Executive Committee and the Board is that we will be asking the Membership for a dues increase next year. We would like to keep it as small as possible. We also would like to be responsive to the suggestion that dues increases be as modest as possible, and that they be regular rather than "crisis" dues increases. I think there is no likelihood that we will stop asking for increases as long as inflation continues. At this moment, then, the best estimate of the Board is that we will propose a dues increase of approximately 15 percent for the next year. About ten percent of that will be for general inflation, and five percent to raise the level of OMS support.

That is my report, and I will be glad to answer any question, or hear any comments. I know we have extended it beyond our time, but I did feel it necessary to get everybody in on the program, and I know you all want to get as much information as you can. I will be here, obviously, for the rest of the meeting, if you want to pin me against the wall privately! All this information will go out to you in the Minutes.

APPENDIX - A

AAU RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES PROJECT:
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Note: This summary was prepared as background for Barbara Turlington's presentation at the ARL Membership Meeting in New York on May 8, 1981.

1. Research Libraries Council

We recommend the establishment of a Research Libraries Council comprising scholars, research librarians, and research university administrators to promote the development of policies and guidelines in the areas of resource sharing, bibliographic standards and control, collection management and development, and preservation.

2. Working with scholars

We urge universities to evaluate the effectiveness of communication and the involvement in policy-making of faculty and library groups on their own campuses and to take whatever steps are needed to improve those processes.

We support the active pursuit by scholarly, library, and university associations of better ways to ensure increased understanding by scholars and librarians of each other's needs and to develop procedures and policies to address those needs.

We urge the National Endowment for the Humanities to establish an Office of Scholarly Communication to monitor technological change and its effects on the system of scholarly communication.

We recommend that the Association of American Universities and the Association of Research Libraries establish a joint standing committee of research library directors, university presidents, and university chief academic officers to monitor needs and developments in library-scholarly communication.

3. Centers of Special Responsibility

The research universities and nonuniversity research library boards should establish, on a voluntary basis, a system of Centers of Special Responsibility through which responsibility for the acquisitions, maintenance, and preservation of regional or national collections in particular topics or areas, and responsibility for creating and maintaining the related data bases and for providing access to the collections, might be divided among the libraries.

Title II-C of the Higher Education Act should be fully funded and should emphasize support of the Centers of Special Responsibility.

4. A National Periodical Center

We recommend the funding of Title II-D of the Higher Education Act for a National Periodical System Corporation and the prompt appointment of a Board and the initiation of a feasibility and implementation study.

We urge private foundation and corporate support for the establishment of an initial phase of a national periodicals service by the Center for Research Libraries and the Association of Research Libraries, and commitment by university and other research libraries to support and use the service.

5. Preservation

We recommend that the proposed Research Libraries Council undertake the responsibility for identifying or establishing an appropriate body to develop national policies for the preservation of library and archival materials and to recommend funding mechanisms for implementation of those policies.

6. Research needs

We recommend that the Association of Research Libraries work with the Council on Library Resources, the Research Libraries Council, library schools, library directors, scholars, and others concerned with the health of research libraries to establish a research agenda for the next decade and to engage in needed data collection analysis.

We urge private foundation, government, and corporate support for this effort.

7. Technology

We recommend that the federal government, state governments, foundations, and corporations mount a coordinated special ten-year project for funding the transition to a new technology for research libraries

8. The role of the private sector - corporate support

We recommend that universities increase their efforts to direct more corporate attention to the needs both of individual research libraries and of cooperative projects to increase services to users.

We urge the Association of Research Libraries to collect and disseminate information about existing corporate/research library cooperative agreements and to consider developing a model agreement for those who would like to increase such cooperation.

We recommend that corporations and corporate foundations increase the size of their contributions to research libraries and in particular to joint projects and to those which will have an impact beyond the individual institution.

9. The role of the research librarian

We recommend that university executive heads and the boards of other research libraries reexamine and strengthen the policy role and the salary structure and other rewards for research librarians and invest sufficient resources in professional library staffs to attract and keep people of the highest intellectual and managerial capabilities.

APPENDIX - B

OMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE POSITION PAPER
Revised April 30, 1981

OMS Financial and Program Strategy

A. Assumptions

1. The Association wants to maintain and strengthen the research consultation, training, and information clearinghouse capabilities devoted to research library concerns that are currently operated within the OMS.

2. The management orientation of the Office will continue with an emphasis on applying management expertise and experience to the examination and resolution of substantive concerns of research libraries (i.e. collections, preservation, services, professional education, etc.).

3. The focus on institutional development and assistance will continue with some energies directed toward the concerns of interinstitutional cooperation, planning, and decision-making.

4. The OMS philosophy of self-help and management assistance will continue to evolve and be complemented by a prescriptive approach to technical and quantitative projects and services.

5. Specific program configuration will be designed on the basis of OMS capabilities, the ARL Board's expression of need and support, the advice and counsel of the OMS Advisory Committee as established by the Board, the interest and support of funding agencies, and the opportunities that can be identified for addressing the concerns of research libraries.

B. An Approach to Financial Management of the OMS

1. There will be an attempt to build a solid financial base centered around ARL support to allow long range planning of services, studies, staffing, and resources.

2. Three major sources of support will be extended to assure continuity: the ARL contribution, cost recovery, and supplementary support from a variety of funding agencies.

3. The ARL contribution is a pivotal component since the Association exercises the governing function. The size of this contribution has evolved to $55,000 for the current year which represents roughly 12 percent of the total operating budget for the OMS in 1980-81. Each year the ARL board reviews the OMS allocation and decides if an inflationary adjustment is justified. The OMS Advisory Committee has studied this allocation and concluded that a redefinition of the level of support is needed. The ARL Board accepted this recommendation and is acting to establish a support level of $110,000 annually in 1984. This level of support would:

a. establish the centrality of ARL financial support for core OMS operations in the future;
b. provide a base for development of future financial support for the OMS;
c. maintain the OMS's program emphasis on research library needs; and
d. anticipate financial deficits presently expected in the third and fourth year of the current funding arrangements.

4. The cost recovery element in the financial plan will continue to be a major component of OMS operations. The present level of cost recovery will undergo inflationary adjustments but will operate around $110,000, or roughly equal to the proposed level of ARL support. Parenthetically, there are opportunities for concentrating on cost recovery activities and changing substantially the level of cost recovery and the nature of OMS activities. This could, however, direct programs toward market needs other than research library needs.

5. The support from these two sources will cover the present core staffing configuration (four professionals) which is judged to be the essential number for program operation.

6. Foundation support will be sought to operate programs and projects of benefit to the research libraries of North America. The level of this support will vary from year to year and from project to project. The Office will bring added staff on only where and for as long as financial support is secured. The nature of these projects will depend heavily on the assumptions (#4) noted earlier.

****

An Outline of OMS Capabilities

The capabilities of the Office of Management Studies can be described in terms of: ongoing programs; services and resources available to member libraries; assistance provided to the Association; and a general role of influencing the development of library management in the library profession. This range of capabilities has evolved over the last ten years and is available primarily for the benefit of ARL members. The amount and degree to which the member libraries take advantage of these programs and services varies, but they are available for use by all ARL members on an as-needed basis.

The Office's ability to provide many of these services and programs is based on the willingness of member libraries to pay for a portion of the direct costs involved in each (staff time, travel, material cost, mailing, etc.). Development costs are covered principally by foundation support and ARL membership dues. Non-ARL members have access to many of the services and resources but on a secondary priority basis and with fees required that include a full recognition of direct costs as well as some portion of the development costs.

1. Ongoing Programs

   a. Research and development in the areas of library management, planning, operations, and decision-making
   b. Academic Library Program
      - Management Review and Analysis Program
      - Collection Analysis Project
      - Preservation Planning Program
      - Public Services Study
      - Academic Library Development Program
      - selection and training of librarians as consultants
   c. Information Services
      - surveys of current practices
      - clearinghouse of information on systems and procedures
      - publications
      - identification of topics for coverage
   d. Training
      - management and supervisory development
      - film resources
      - Management Skills Institutes
      - preparation of training materials

2. Member Services and Resources

   a. participation in any OMS self-study program at a reduced rate
   b. consultation on design and operation of internal studies, committee work, or problem-solving efforts
   c. telephone reference service on relevant questions
   d. training programs designed to individual library specifications
   e. first priority for public Management Skills Institutes
   f. design and conduct of special focus workshops held locally on topics selected by member libraries
   g. Management Skills Institutes held at member libraries
   h. access to SPEC files and past surveys
   i. on-demand SPEC surveys
   j. monthly SPEC flyers and kits at a reduced rate

3. Assistance Provided to the Association

   a. assistance in planning for membership meetings and programs
   b. contributions to selected ARL meetings and workshops
   c. work with executive staff on Association matters
   d. responding to board and committee needs and interests
   e. representing the Association interests on national matters

4. Influencing the Development of Research Library Management on a Profession-wide Basis

   a. contributing to the design and conduct of relevant research projects
   b. participating in relevant advisory committees, panels, conferences, and other activities
   c. preparing or contributing to papers and publications for the profession and higher education generally

APPENDIX - C

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
SUMMARY OF 1980 ANNUAL REPORT*

Introduction

In 1980, the Association of Research Libraries Office of Management Studies completed its tenth year. Throughout its existence, the Office has addressed the challenge of improving research library performance through assisted self-study, information gathering and dissemination, staff training and development programs, and consultation services. Because the establishment of the OMS coincided with the beginning of a new decade, the tendency to assess its accomplishments within the general complexion of the seventies is almost irresistible. During this ten-year period, economic, political, and social trends heavily influenced the resources and performance of research institutions and their libraries. Higher education, a relatively affluent sector in the sixties, has to face the challenges of changing demographic patterns, economic adversity, and an intensive societal examination. These trends also have impacted research libraries more than ever before.

Each university and each research library has had different experiences and different problems. Yet to a degree it is possible to specify a set of critical areas of choice for library administrators as we enter the new decade. These choices occur in all sectors of operations, and they are interrelated. Collection development philosophies and patterns are affected by budgetary changes, but also by the available expertise of staff members and inter-institutional collaboration. Similarly, there is a relationship between staffing and the array of services to be offered — but there are hard choices to be made among relative allocations for staff, collections, and services. Technology, although it makes expanded services possible, absorbs staff and financial resources. And inter-institutional collaboration, while desirable, may produce problems when it conflicts with local needs. Balancing a set of such demands within a constricted budget while taking into account the aspirations of staff, students, faculty, and administration has been the story of the latter seventies.

The habit of thinking in arbitrary time spans, however, can be a dangerous strategy. The tendency to separate decades implies a concentration on change rather than continuity. Yet it is continuity that shapes most activities. It rarely is possible to forecast the general complexion of the years ahead, but it is important to adjust to traceable shifts. In the context of the OMS operation, many of the needs of the seventies have still to be met, but it has become essential to change the mode of response. A balance of modification and innovation in addressing institutional needs is required at a time when there are repeated pressures to examine, to justify and to formulate measurable results for all programs.

The basic OMS approach to assisting the analysis of research library problems evolved during its first years of operation. It is summarized by the assisted self-study method, which engages the library staff in analyzing library operations and suggesting possible improvements. This methodology was first used to address general management issues but it has been applied to the study of collections, preservation, and public services issues as well.

*The complete Office of Management Studies Annual Report for 1980 is available from the OMS.

Briefly, assisted self-study proceeds under the following assumptions. First, libraries exist within rapidly changing environments, and to be effective, organizations must undertake periodic reassessments that lead toward administrative and organizational change. Second, the persons best qualified to undertake the analysis are those who are highly involved in both day-to-day operations and long-range planning or who are representative of the library's constituencies. Third, it is essential to proceed under the assumption that the commitment exists to produce a study that will have measurable and pragmatic results. The third assumption is fully tested by OMS staff before the self-study process begins.

Library directors have found participation in the assisted self-study programs useful for a number of reasons:

1. Momentum. A systematic assessment of a variety of major, complex and often highly political problems often serves to generate the required momentum for change.

2. Understanding and Motivation. Involvement of library staff in issues analysis is often instrumental in producing an understanding of existing pressures, and the experience can act as a motivating force.

3. Assessment Program. Review is desirable when some changes in priorities or emphases appear probable.

4. Recognition. The study process can serve to identify a variety of personnel and administrative concerns as well as to provide a rationale for action.

5. Staff Development. Participation in the self-study process builds skills, abilities and knowledge of library staff. This improved understanding of the organization can lead to better job performance over time, and benefits the profession as a whole by promoting general improvement for both organization and staff.

6. Involvement. For many library staff members, the self-study process provides a rare opportunity to influence organizational change and programs.

Two other components of the OMS approach are its informational and staff training and development programs. Collection and dissemination of information through the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) allows libraries to assess a range of possible institutional approaches and responses to particular issues. The training program helps academic libraries equip their staffs with the skills and abilities required for improved performance. In all OMS programs, a major emphasis is upon direct consultation and assistance to individual librarians, under the assumption that an assessment of specific needs in a particular situation is the method best suited to their resolution even where problems appear to be similar.

During the past few years, several new programs have evolved partly from research, study and training activities, and from staff experience and expertise.

However, innovative aspects of programs also have been fostered by ARL Executive Office leadership, the counsel of advisory committees and the advice of funding agencies. Four recent initiatives are particularly noteworthy.

The assisted self-study strategy has been extended to address the changing needs of the early eighties. The early emphasis on completing management studies has given way to an adaptation of the Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP) techniques for substantive issues beyond management concerns. The Public Services Study, for example, is designed to offer libraries an opportunity to examine operations, management, and user needs in an effort to improve their knowledge of ongoing programs and their ability to meet changing user requirements.

Another program, the Preservation Planning Program, is now in its second year of development. Library preservation needs have long been viewed as a major concern, and this concern resurfaced during the late seventies. However, very little has been done to educate librarians in the managerial and technical aspects of maintaining collections or to help the individual librarian recognize and resolve preservation problems. OMS self-study and technical programs now being developed are an attempt to meet those needs, recognizing that important developments on the national scene must go hand in hand with institutional development.

The OMS Collection Analysis Project has been available since 1977. The value of this particular self-study is attested by the fact that it is the most demanded of all Office programs at this time. However, the topic of cooperative collection development is an initiative that has become increasingly important as the economic climate forces libraries to scale down their local collecting efforts. Analyzing cooperative efforts and encouraging programs that involve more than one library in the collection development task are current Office concerns.

Finally, the OMS investment in human resource development continues. In addition to the training programs for supervisors and managers, a major effort is directed toward training several successive groups of highly qualified librarians to serve as consultants, most of them from ARL libraries. The recruitment and training of these professionals enables the Office to expand its training and self-study efforts with their assistance. However, this is not the only reason for such a program, nor is it even a major part of the rationale. The training effort will produce a group of individuals who have the management skills and perspectives to bring to both their current positions and future, more advanced, responsibilities in their home libraries. In training individuals to recognize and assist development efforts and needs in many libraries, the profession gains immeasurably in providing an increasing number of libraries with better administrators.

The approaches to management development and organizational problem-solving provided by the OMS are meant to place research libraries in a proactive stance regarding environmental pressures. In the future, the issues may change, but the basic challenge to adapt, to change, and thereby to grow in a demanding environment will continue to require the best thinking, creativity, and ingenuity in academic librarianship. The following report chronicles the current OMS attempts to aid libraries in responding to the challenges of the eighties. The report concludes with a brief review of priorities for developmental activity in 1981.

Highlights of OMS Activities in 1980

1. Twenty-eight libraries participated in the Academic Library Program (ALP) during 1980. Within the ALP, the Office continued to develop modular programs to allow libraries to conduct discrete segments of each program as well as to complete full self-studies:

   a. The Management Review and Analysis Program was under way at Ball State University, with a report expected in early 1981.

   b. Three libraries worked with the Organizational Screening Program: Syracuse University, Temple University and North Texas State University.

   c. The Collection Analysis Project (CAP) assisted seven libraries in initiating or pursuing self-studies: Case Western Reserve University, McGill University, the University of Maryland, the University of Illinois, the University of British Columbia, the University of Notre Dame and Franklin and Marshall College.

   d. Full-scale program reviews within the framework of the Academic Library Development Program began at Southeast Missouri State, and the University of the Pacific.

   e. In addition to the 20 libraries in Indiana, Illinois and Michigan, libraries completing the Planning Program for Small Academic Libraries under the Lilly Endowment grant, St. Olaf College and Carleton College, and Transylvania University are participating. Lilly has awarded the OMS a $39,000 grant to complete the project.

2. The Acedenuc Library Public Servuces Study, a new effort to involve library staff in reviewing public services, user needs, university support and library capabilities, began with a series of workshops at the University of California, Berkeley. A survey of public services policies and practices among ARL libraries was completed, and design of a manual for the self-study process was begun. As the year ended, Office staff prepared to assist the University of Houston in the conduct of a public services study.

3. The first Academic Library Consultant Training Program class of 20 librarians chosen in 1979 was placed on self-study or training assignments. Finalists for a second class to be trained in early 1981 were chosen.

4. The Preservation Program funded for a two-year period by the National Endowment for the Humanities completed its first year. Pamela W. Darling began her duties as Preservation Specialist in July. In addition, a program advisory committee was constituted. A survey of preservation practices among ARL libraries was completed, two SPEC kits were published, and a preservation self-study manual was partially

drafted. The University of Washington, the University of Virginia, and Dartmouth College were chosen as the pilot test libraries for the program.

5. OMS staff acted as consultants for the Circulation Study Project conducted by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest under a grant from the Council on Library Resources. A Circulation Study Manual was developed and a working relationship with CAP was established.

6. The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) issued ten Flyers and Kits in 1980 covering the topics of Library Materials Cost Studies, Status of Librarians, On-Line Bibliographic Search Services, Retrospective Conversion, Indirect Cost Rates, Collective Bargaining, Affirmative Action Programs, Planning for Preservation, AACR2 Implementation Studies, and Preparing for Emergencies and Disasters. The Center maintained 257 subscriptions and distributed 6,000 publications.

7. The Organizational Training and Staff Development Program activities included four Management Skills Institutes, 14 Special Focus workshops, and the training film service. Maureen S. Schechter joined the staff as Training Program Specialist.

8. A new program intended to help selected librarians complete issue-oriented research and publication projects has been launched. The papers produced by the first two participants, Joanne Euster and William Jones, for the Collaborative Research/Writing Program will be published early in 1981.

OMS Priorities for 1981

The Office of Management Studies reviews its program priorities annually with the assistance and advice of the OMS Advisory Committee established by the ARL Board of Directors. The committee meets at least four times a year to review activities and priorities, and to plan future programs. OMS priorities comprise developmental, operational, and internal needs.

The major developmental priorities for 1981 are the Preservation and Public Services Study programs. Both are well under way, but each requires refinement, testing, and further analysis. Completion of program manuals and testing the studies in pilot project libraries are the major priorities. In addition the Collection Use and Assessment Project for Small Academic Libraries should see further development, including preparation of a working manual and pilot studies.

Operational priorities relate to the ongoing OMS programs. During 1981 the Small Academic Libraries Planning Program studies should be completed and the Office plans to schedule up to 20 additional self-study projects under the ALP. The trainees in the second class of consultants will attend an intensive two-week institute and all will be involved in some project experience or training activity. The process of selecting a third class of consultants will begin. A major review of the Collection Analysis Project's impact on participating libraries also is scheduled.

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) will conduct several surveys, issue ten kits and flyers, and assist in the preparation of self-study manuals. Preservation and public services will receive heavy emphasis in the publication program. Topics scheduled for coverage are external user services, fees for service, service to disabled users, preservation of materials, professional development, microcomputers and internships.

The two publications from the 1980 Collaborative Research/Writing project will be produced and OMS will move ahead with the next phase of this program which includes working with a larger number of consultants in the preparation of SPEC kits and flyers.

The present training programs will be maintained at current levels, including in 1981: three basic Management Skills Institutes, 15 Special Focus workshops, and maintenance of the training film program. An Advanced Management Skills Institute is scheduled for November 1981, and an additional basic Institute will be held at Ohio State University in June 1981. Special training projects such as management resource workshops and collection assessment workshops will be considered as funds become available.

The Association is presently planning to extend its direct financial support of OMS programs to assure their continuity. The new approach to fiscal planning will center around ARL support to allow long range planning of services, studies, staffing and resources. Three major sources of support will be extended to assure continuity: the ARL contribution, cost recovery and supplementary support from a variety of funding agencies.

The planning for OMS program development is based on a broad and continuing assessment of member needs and capabilities. Several methods are used for securing information on these needs as well as monitoring the availability of OMS programs including: OMS staff working with member libraries, evaluation of specific training, study and publication activities, OMS Advisory Committee ideas and insights, the ARL Executive Staff, the ARL Board of Directors, advisory committees set up for specific projects, and comments from individual library directors and staff members. As the Office begins a second decade of work, elements of change appear in specific program elements, but responding to libraries' needs continues to be the major determinant of Office activity and the hallmark of its philosophy.

Bibliography of OMS Publications and Related Documents in 1980

Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies. Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. SPEC Flyers and Kits 60-69. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1980.

- Library Materials Cost Studies, #60, January 1980, 108 pp.
- Status of Librarians: An Overview, #61, February 1980, 105 pp.
- On-Line Bibliographic Search Services, #62, March 1980, 107 pp.
- Collective Bargaining, #63, April 1980, 115 pp.
- Indirect Cost Rates in Research Libraries, #64, May 1980, 87 pp.
- Retrospective Conversion, #65, June 1980, 91 pp.
- Planning for Preservation, #66, July-August 1980, 99 pp.
- Affirmative Action Programs, #67, September 1980, 87 pp.
- AACR 2 Implementation Studies, #68, October 1980, 117 pp.
- Preparing for Emergencies and Disasters, #69, November-December 1980, 107 pp.

Case Western Reserve University Libraries. Collection Analysis Project: Final Report. Cleveland, Ohio. April 1980, 70 pp.

Darling, Pamela W. "Beset by Foes on Every Side", Disasters: Prevention & Coping, Proceedings of the Conference May 21-22, 1980, ed. by James N. Meyers & Denise D. Bedferd. Stanford CA, Stanford University Libraries, 1981, p. 18-23.

Darling, Pamela W. "Collection Officer or Collector: The Preservation Side of the Development Responsibility", Collection Development in Libraries, ed. Robert D. Steuart and George B. Miller, Jr., Greenwich, Conn., JAI Press, 1980, v. 1, p. 281-288.

Darling, Pamela W. "Doing Preservation, With or Without Money", Oklahoma Librarian, October 1980, 30:20-26.

Darling, Pamela W. "From Problems Perceived to Programs in Practice: the Preservation of Library Materials in the USA, 1956-1980", with Sherelyn Ogden. Library Resources & Techincal Services 25:9-29 (Jan/March 1981).

Darling, Pamela W. "Housekeeping", Preservation of Library Materials, Proceedings of SLA/LBI Seminar July 20-21, 1979, ed. by Joyce R. Russell. New York: Special Libraries Association, 1980, p.6-13.

Darling, Pamela W. "Preservation", Minutes of the 96th Meeting, May 15-16, 1980 Washington, Association of Research Libraries, 1980, p. 28-33.

Darling, Pamela W. "Preservation: Today on a Shoestring, Tomorrow...?" Library Journal, April 1, 1980, 781-785.

Darling, Pamela W. "The Preservation of Library Materials: A CUL Handbook", Preservation Department, Columbia University Libraries, 1980. 65 p.

Manchester College, Funderburg Library. Small Library Planning Program: Report of the Self-Study. North Manchester, Indiana. 1980, 165 pp.

Morein, P. Grady. "The Indiana Experience with Self-Study". Indiana Libraries, vol. #2, Summer 1980.

North Texas State University Libraries. Organization Study Team - Final Report. April 14-July 23, 1980, 55 pp.

Saint Mary's College. Small Library Planning Program: Report of the Self Study. Notre Dame, Indiana. October 1980, 202 pp.

Sitts, Maxine K. "Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies", in Bowker Annual, New York, N.Y., R.R. Bowker Company, 1981, pp. 120-124.

Sitts, Maxine K. "Office of Management Studies", ALA Yearbook, Chicago, Illinois, American Library Association, 1980, p. 60.

Taylor University. Small Library Planning Program: Report of the Self-Study. Upland, Indiana. April 1980, 123 pp.

Temple University. Report of the Task Force on Reorganization. Paley Library, 1980, 92 pp.

University of Illinois Library at Urbana-Champaign. Collection Analysis Project: Interim Report. Jan. 1980, 127 pp.

Valparaiso University. Small Library Planning Program: Report of the Self-Study. Valparaiso, Indiana. October 1980, 227 pp.

Webster, Duane E. "Cooperative Collection Devlopment for Libraries" in Cooperative Collection Development for Missouri Libraries A Beginning - Goals and Methods. Proceeding from the Missouri Library Association 1980 Annual Conference, September 25-27, 1980. Columbia, Mo., Missouri Library Association, in press.

Webster, Duane E. "Description of the Management Review and Analysis Program" in Johnson Edward R. and Stuart H., Mann. Organization Development for Academic Libraries. Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press, 1980.

Webster, Duane E. and John G. Lorenz. "Effective Use of Library Consultants", in Library Trends, Winter 1980, pp. 345-362.

Webster, Duane E. "Ownership and Distribution of Machine Readable Bibliographic Data".
Washington, D.C., Network Advisory Committee, 1980.

Webster, Duane E. and Maureen S. Schechter, "Libraries", D. Kent Halstead, ed. Higher Education Bibliography, vol. 2. Washington, D.C., National Institute of Education, forthcoming. 680 pp.

Webster, Duane E. , Jeffrey Gardner and Maxine Sitts. The Public Services Study Manual, Washington, D.C., Office of Management Studies, January 1981. A working draft for developmental purposes.

APPENDIX - D

ATTENDANCE AT 98TH MEMBERSHIP MEETING
NEW YORK, N.Y.
May 7-8, 1981

University of Alabama Libraries
Not represented

University of Alberta Library
Bruce Peel

University of Arizona Library
Mary Dale Palsson

Arizona State University Library
Donald Riggs

Boston Public Library
Philip J. McNiff

Boston University Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University Library
Sterling J. Albrecht

University of British Columbia Library
Basil Stuart-Stubbs

Brown University Library
C. James Schmidt

University of California, Berkeley Library
Joseph Rosenthal

University of California, Davis Library
Bernard Kreissman

University of California, Los Angeles Library
Russell Shank

University of California, Riverside Library
John Tanno

University of California, San Diego Library
Millicent D. Abell

University of California, Santa Barbara Library
Allen B. Veaner

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
James V. Jones

Center for Research Libraries
Not represented

University of Chicago Library
Martin D. Runkle

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Charles B. Osburn

University of Colorado Library
Clyde Walton

Colorado State University Library
Not represented

Columbia University Libraries
Patricia Battin

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
Louis E. Martin

Dartmouth College Libraries
Margaret A. Otto

Duke University Libraries
Not represented

Emory University Library
Herbert F. Johnson

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
Charles E. Miller

Georgetown University Library
James De Lancey

University of Georgia Libraries
David F. Bishop

University of Guelph Library
Not represented

Harvard University Library
Y. T. Feng

University of Hawaii Library
Kengo Yasumatsu

University of Houston Libraries
Robin Downes

Howard University Libraries
Juanita W. Portis

University of Illinois Library
Hugh Atkinson

Indiana University Libraries
Elaine F. Sloan

University of Iowa Libraries
Not represented

Iowa State University Library
Not represented

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
Susan K. Martin

University of Kansas Library
Mary Hawkins

University of Kentucky Libraries
Ruth Brown

Kent State University Libraries
Hyman W. Kritzer

Library of Congress
William Welsh

Linda Hall Library
Thomas D. Gillies

Louisiana State University Library
George Guidry, Jr.

McGill University Library
Marianne Scott

McMaster University Library
Graham R. Hill

University of Maryland Library
H. Joanne Harrar

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Richard Talbot

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Jay K. Lucker

University of Miami Library
Not represented

University of Michigan Library
Richard M. Dougherty

Michigan State University Library
Richard E. Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Eldred Smith

University of Missouri Library
Not represented

National Agricultural Library
Sam Waters

National Library of Canada
Joseph Guy Sylvestre

National Library of Medicine
Lois Ann Colaianni

University of Nebraska Libraries
Brice G. Hobrock

The Newberry Library
Joel L. Samuels

University of New Mexico Library
Paul Vassallo

New York Public Library
David H. Stam

New York State Library
Joseph F. Shubert

New York University Libraries
Carlton C. Rochell

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Robert C. Miller

Ohio State University Libraries
William J. Studer

University of Oklahoma Library
Sul H. Lee

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
George W. Shipman

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Not represented

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Glenora E. Rossell

Princeton University Library
Donald Koepp

Purdue University Library
Not represented

Queen's University Library
Not represented

Rice University Library
Samuel Carrington

University of Rochester Libraries
James F. Wyatt

Rutgers University Library
Hendrik Edelman

University of Saskatchewan Library
Not represented

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Robert Maloy

University of South Carolina Library
Kenneth E. Toombs

University of Southern Calif. Library
Roy L. Kidman

Southern Illinois University Library
Kenneth G. Peterson

Stanford University Libraries
Not represented

State University of New York at Albany
Joseph Z. Nitecki

State University of New York at Buffalo
Saktidas Roy

State University of New York at Stony Brook
John B. Smith

Syracuse University Libraries
Donald C. Anthony

Temple University Library
Joseph Boisse

University of Tennessee Libraries
Donald R. Hunt

University of Texas Libraries
Harold W. Billings

Texas A & M University Library
Irene B. Hoadley

University of Toronto Libraries
David G. Esplin

Tulane University Library
William Newman

University of Utah Libraries
Roger K. Hanson

Vanderbilt University Library
Frank P. Grisham

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Univ.
Thomas Souter

University of Virginia Libraries
Ray Frantz

University of Washington Library
Not represented

Washington State University Library
Allene F. Schnaitter

Washington University Libraries
Renata Rotkowicz

Wayne State University Libraries
Vern M. Pings

University of Western Ontario Library
Robert Lee

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Joseph Treyz

Yale University Libraries
Rutherford D. Rogers

York University Library
Anne Woodsworth

ATTENDANCE BY THE MEMBERSHIP - NAME INDEX

Abell, Millicent D.	University of California, San Diego Library
Albrecht, Sterling J.	Brigham Young University Library
Anthony, Donald C.	Syracuse University Libraries
Atkinson, Hugh	University of Illinois Library
Battin, Patricia	Columbia University Libraries
Billings, Harold W.	University of Texas Libraries
Bishop, David F.	University of Georgia Libraries
Boisse, Joseph	Temple University Library
Brown, Ruth	University of Kentucky Libraries
Budington, William S.	John Crerar Library
Carrington, Samuel	Rice University Library
Chapin, Richard E.	Michigan State University Library
Colaianni, Lois Ann	National Library of Medicine
De Lancey, James	Georgetown University Library
Dougherty, Richard M.	University of Michigan Library
Downes, Robin	University of Houston Libraries
Edelman, Hendrik	Rutgers University Library
Esplin, David G.	University of Toronto Libraries
Feng, Y. T.	Harvard University Library
Forth, Stuart	Pennsylvania State University Library
Frantz, Ray	University of Virginia Libraries
Gillies, Thomas D.	Linda Hall Library
Govan, James F.	University of North Carolina Libraries
Grisham, Frank P.	Vanderbilt University Library
Guidry, George	Louisiana State University Library
Hanson, Roger K.	University of Utah Libraries
Harrar, H. Joanne	University of Maryland Library
Harrer, Gustave A.	University of Florida Libraries
Hawkins, Mary	University of Kansas Library
Hill, Graham R.	McMaster University Library
Hoadley, Irene B.	Texas A&M University Library
Hobrock, Brice G.	University of Nebraska Libraries
Hunt, Donald R.	University of Tennessee Libraries
Johnson, Herbert F.	Emory University Library
Jones, James V.	Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Kidman, Roy L.	University of Southern California Library
Koepp, Donald	Princeton University Library
Kreissman, Bernard	University of California, Davis Library
Kritzer, Hyman W.	Kent State University Libraries

Laucus, John	Boston University Library
Lee, Robert	University of Western Ontario Library
Lee, Sul H.	University of Oklahoma Library
Lucker, Jay K.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
McDonald, John P.	University of Connecticut Library
McGowan, John P.	Northwestern University Libraries
McNiff, Philip J.	Boston Public Library
Maloy, Robert	Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Martin, Louis E.	Cornell University Libraries
Martin, Susan K.	Johns Hopkins University Library
Miller, Charles E.	Florida State University Library
Miller, Robert C.	University of Notre Dame Libraries
Newman, William	Tulane University Library
Nitecki, Joseph Z.	State University of New York at Albany Libraries
Osburn, Charles B.	University of Cincinnati Libraries
Otto, Margaret A.	Dartmouth College Libraries
Palsson, Mary Dale	University of Arizona Library
Peel, Bruce	University of Alberta Library
Peterson, Kenneth G.	Southern Illinois University Library
Pings, Vern M.	Wayne State University Libraries
Portis, Juanita W.	Howard University Libraries
Riggs, Donald	Arizona State University Library
Rochell, Carlton C.	New York University Libraries
Rogers, Rutherford D.	Yale University Library
Rosenthal, Joseph	University of California, Berkeley Library
Rossell, Glenora E.	University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Rotkowicz, Renata	Washington University Libraries
Rouse, Roscoe	Oklahoma State University Library
Roy, Saktidas	State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Runkle, Martin D.	University of Chicago Library
Samuels, Joel L.	Newberry Library
Schmidt, C. James	Brown University Library
Schnaitter, Allene F.	Washington State University Library
Scott, Marianne	McGill University Library
Shank, Russell	University of California, Los Angeles Library
Shipman, George W.	University of Oregon Library
Shubert, Joseph F.	New York State Library
Sloan, Elaine F.	Indiana University Libraries
Smith, Eldred	University of Minnesota Libraries
Smith, John B.	State University of New York at Stony Brook Library
Souter, Thomas	Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Stam, David H.	New York Public Library
Stuart-Stubbs, Basil	University of British Columbia Library
Studer, William J.	Ohio State University Libraries
Sylvestre, Joseph Guy	National Library of Canada

Talbot, Richard	University of Massachusetts Libraries
Tanno, John	University of California, Riverside Library
Toombs, Kenneth E.	University of South Carolina Library
Treyz, Joseph	University of Wisconsin Libraries
Vassallo, Paul	University of New Mexico Library
Veaner, Allen B.	University of California, Santa Barbara Library
Walton, Clyde	University of Colorado Library
Waters, Sam	National Agricultural Library
Welsh, William	Library of Congress
Woodsworth, Anne	York University Library
Wyatt James F.	University of Rochester Libraries
Yasumatsu, Kengo	University of Hawaii Library

Guests

Page Ackerman	OMS Advisory Committee (speaker)
James Anderson	Graduate School of Library & Information Studies, Rutgers University
Calvin Boyer	University of California, Irvine Library
Susan Brynteson	University of Delaware Libraries
Steven Cahn	The Rockefeller Foundation
Margaret Child	National Endowment for the Humanities (speaker)
Phyllis Dain	School of Library Service, Columbia University
Richard Darling	School of Library Service, Columbia University
Suzanne Frankie	New York University Libraries
Beverlee French	CLR Intern - University of Connecticut Library
Arnold Goren	New York University (speaker)
Ann Greenberg	New York University (speaker)
Gertrude Gunn	Canadian Association of Research Libraries
Kathleen Gunning	CLR Intern - University of Wisconsin Libraries
C. Lee Jones	Council on Library Resources
Thomas V. Litzenburg, Jr.	Association of American Universities
Stephen McCarthy	
Kathleen Moltz	School of Library Service, Columbia University
Kathleen Moretto	CLR Intern - University of North Carolina Libraries
James Morris	Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Thomas Mott	Graduate School of Library & Information Studies, Rutgers University
Maxine Reneker	CRL Intern - Columbia University Libraries
Charlene Renner	CLR Intern - University of California, Berkeley Library
Marilyn Sharrow	University of Manitoba Library
Barbara Turlington	Association of American Universities (speaker)
Julie Virgo	Association of College & Research Libraries/ALA

ARL Staff

Shirley Echelman, Executive Director
Ralph E. McCoy, Interim Executive Director
Carol A. Mandel, Associate Executive Director
Nicola Daval, Information Officer
Duane E. Webster, Director, Office of Management Studies
Jeffrey J. Gardner, Associate, Office of Management Studies
Maureen S. Schechter, Training Program Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Maxine Sitts, Information Services Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Pamela W. Darling, Preservation Specialist, Office of Management Studies

APPENDIX - E

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

MAY 1981

ARL OFFICERS AND BOARD FOR 1980/1981

Jay K. Lucker, President
Millicent D. Abell, Vice President & President-Elect
Irene B. Hoadley, Executive Committee Member-at-Large

Sterling J. Albrecht	(Oct. 1983)
Charles Churchwell	(Oct. 1982)
James F. Govan	(Oct. 1983)
Donald Koepp	(Oct. 1983)
Margot B. McBurney	(Oct. 1981)
Eldred R. Smith	(Oct. 1982)
James F. Wyatt	(Oct. 1981)

STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on ARL Statistics

Kendon Stubbs, University of Virginia (1982)
Anne Woodsworth (1982)
Richard J. Talbot, Chairman (1982)

Committee on Interlibrary Loan

H. Gordon Bechanan (1983)
Bernard Kreissman (1983)
Glenora E. Rossell (1982)
Sterling J. Albrecht (1982)
Kenneth G. Peterson, Chairman (1981)

Committee on Preservation of Research Libraries Materials

Joanne Harrar (1981)
David Laird (1982)
Joel L. Samuels (1982)
Clyde Walton (1983)
David H. Stam, Chairman (1982)
Pamela Darling, ex-officio (1981)

Committee on Nominations

ARL Vice President, Chairman

Federal Relations Committee

Charles Churchwell (1982)
Richard M. Dougherty (1982)
Roger K. Hanson (1983)
Russell Shank (1983)
George W. Shipman (1982)
Carlton C. Rochell, Chairman (1983)

Membership Committee on Nonacademic Libraries

Margaret Beckman (1982)
William S. Budington 1983)
Robert C. Miller (1982)
Robert Maloy (1982)
Roy L. Kidman, Chairman (1983)

ARL/CRL Joint Committee on Expanded Access to Journal Collections

Susan Brynteson, University of Delaware
Richard K. Chapin
* Donald Koepp
* John P. McDonald
Elaine Sloan
Richard J. Talbot
* C. James Schmidt, Chairman

* ARL representatives

ARL COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

Africa

Peter Duignan, Hoover Institution of War, Peace, and Revolution
J.M.D. Crossey, Yale University
Esther J. Walls, SUNY Stony Brook
Julian Witherell, Library of Congress
Hans Panofsky, Northwestern University, Chairman

Middle East

George N. Atiyeh, Library of Congress
James Pollack, University of Indiana
David H. Partington, Harvard University, Chairman

Eastern Europe

Nina Lencek, Columbia University
Laurence Miller, University of Illinois
Joseph A Placek, University of Michigan
Anna Stuliglowa, Cornell University
Wojciech Zalewski, Stanford University
David H. Kraus, Library of Congress, Chairman

East Asia

Weying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress, Chairman

South Asia

Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
Maureen Patterson, University of Chicago
Louis A. Jacob, Library of Congress, Chairman

Southeast Asia

Charles Bryant, Yale University
John Musgrave, University of Michigan

Latin America

Nettie Lee Benson, University of Texas
Donald Wisdom, Library of Congress
Carl W. Deal, University of Illinois, Chairman

ARL TASK FORCES

Task Force on Bibliographic Control (1983)

David Bishop
Merle N. Boylan
Joseph H. Howard, Library of Congress
Joseph Rosenthal
James F. Govan, Chairman

Task Force on Collection Development (1983)

Henqrik Edelman
John Finzi, Library of Congress
Warren Kuhn
Charles Osburn
Marianne Scott
Joseph Treyz, Chairman

Task Force on Library Education (1982)

Patricia Battin
Stuart Forth
Irene B. Hoadley
Herbert F. Johnson
James Ranz
Margot B. McBurney, Chairman

Task Force on National Library Network Development (1983)

Harold W. Billings
John P. McGowan
Susan K. Martin
William J. Welsh
William J. Studer, Chairman

REPRESENTATIVES

ALA Committee on Cataloging:
Description and Access. . . . . Carol Mandel
ALA Interlibrary Loan Committee . . . . . .Kenneth Peterson
ALA Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee . . . Carol Mandel
ANSI Committee Z39. . . . . .Ralph McCoy
CONSER Advisory Group . . . . . .Carol Mandel
Eighteenth-Century Short Title Catalogue. . . . . .Ray Frantz
Joint Committee on Union List of Serials . . . . . .William Budington
LC Bibliographic Advisory Committee . . . . . .James Govan
LC Cataloging in Publication Advisory Group . . . . .Carol Mandel
LC Network Advisory Committee . . . . . William Studer
Society of American Archivists. . . . . C. Herbert Finch, Cornell
Universal Serials & Book Exchange . . . . . Joanne Harrar
National Conservation Advisory Committee . . . . . .David Stam
IFLA Standing Committee on Library Buildings
and Equipment . . . . . Roscoe Rouse

CENTER FOR CHINESE RESEARCH MATERIALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Lloyd E. Eastman, University of Illinois (1981)
Ying-mao Kau, Brown University (1981)
David T. Roy, University of Chicago (1981)
Weiying Wan, University of Michigan (1981)
Eugene Wu, Harvard University (1981)
Philip J. McNiff, Chairman (1981)

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Page Ackerman, UCLA Graduate School of Lib. and Info. Science (1982)
Frank P. Grisham (1981)
Louis E. Martin (1982)
Frank Rodgers (1983)
Martin Runkle (1983)
Irene B. Hoadley, Chairman (1981)

APPENDIX - F

MEMBERSHIP LIST
MAY 1981

University of Alabama Libraries
P.O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
Malcolm McDonald, Interim Director of Libraries
(205) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2JB
Bruce Peel, Libn. to the Univ.
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 626-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Riggs, Libn.
(602) 965-3417

Boston Public Library
Copley Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University Library
324 Lee Library
Provo, Utah 84602
Sterling J. Albrecht, Director
(801) 378-2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
C. James Schmidt, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California, Berkeley Library
Berkeley, California 94720
Joseph Rosenthal, Director
(415) 642-3773

University of California, Davis Library
Davis, California 95616
Bernard Kreissman, Librarian
(916) 752-2110

University of California, Los Angeles Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Russell Shank, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California, Riverside Library
P.O. Box 5900
Riverside, California 92507
John Tanno, Acting Univ. Libn.
(714) 787-3221

University of California, San Diego
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92037
Millicent D. Abell, Librarian
(714) 452-3061

University of California, Santa Barbara
The University Library
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Allen B. Veaner, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
5721 Cottage Grove Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Donald B. Simpson, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Martin D. Runkle, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Charles B. Osburn, Vice Provost
for Univ. Libraries
(513) 475-2218

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80309
Clyde Walton, Director
(303) 492-7511

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Patricia Battin, Vice Pres.
& Univ. Libn.
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
Louis E. Martin, Univ. Libn.
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Margaret A. Otto, Libn.
(603) 646-2235

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Elvin E. Strowd, Interim Univ. Librn.
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Herbert F. Johnson, Director
(404) 329-6861

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles E. Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D.C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
David Bishop, Director
(404) 542-2716

University of Guelph Library
Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 2W1
Margaret Beckman, Chief Libn.
(519) 824-4120

Harvard University Library
Wadsworth House
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Oscar Handlin, Director
(617) 495-2401

University of Hawaii Library
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Don L. Bosseau, Director
(808) 948-7205

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Robin Downes, Director
(713) 749-4241

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D.C. 20001
Binford H. Conley, Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
1408 West Gregory Drive
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Hugh C. Atkinson, Univ. Librn.
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
Elaine F. Sloan, Dean of Univ. Librs.
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Lib. Admin.
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50011
Warren B. Kuhn, Dean of Lib. Services
(515) 294-1442

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
The Milton S. Eisenhower Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Susan K. Martin, Libn.
(301) 338-8325

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
James Ranz, Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul A. Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Hyman W. Kritzer, Assistant Provost & Director of Libraries
(216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540
Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian
(202) 287-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry, Jr., Director
(504) 388-2217

McGill University Library
3459 McTavish Street
Montreal, Canada H3A 1Y1
Marianne Scott, Director
(514) 392-4949

McMaster University Library
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L85 4L6
Graham R. Hill, University Librarian
(416) 525-9140 Local 4359

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Jay K. Lucker, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Miami Library
P.O. Box 248214
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
Frank Rodgers, Director
(305) 284-3551

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Richard M. Dougherty, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard E. Chapin, Director
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Eldred Smith, Director
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
John Gribbin, Director
(314) 882-4701

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Richard A. Farley, Director
(301) 344-4248

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A 0N4
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 996-1623

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Gerald A. Rudolph, Dean of Libraries
(402) 472-7211

The Newberry Library
60 West Walton Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
Joel L. Samuels, Dir. of Lib. Sers.
(312) 943-9090

The University of New Mexico
General Library
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
Paul Vassallo, Dean of Lib. Sers.
(505) 277-4241

New York Public Library
Fifth Avenue at 42nd Street
New York, New York 10018
David H. Stam, Director of the
Research Libraries
(212) 930-0709

New York State Library
Cultural Education Center
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12234
Joseph F. Shubert, State Librarian
(518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Carlton C. Rochell, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-7676

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 962-1301

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
Robert C. Miller, Librarian
(219) 283-4674

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
William J. Studer, Director
(614) 422-4241

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
Sul H. Lee, Director
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078
Roscoe Rouse, Dean of Lib. Ser.
(405) 624-6321

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
George W. Shipman, Univ. Libn.
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 243-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Donald Koepp, Director
(609) 452-3170

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 494-2900

Queen's University
Douglas Library
Kingston, Canada K7L 5C4
Margot B. McBurney, Chief Libn.
(613) 547-5950

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main, Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Samuel Carrington, Director
(713) 527-4022

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
James F. Wyatt, Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Hendrik Edelman, Univ. Libn.
(201) 932-7505

University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Canada S7N OWO
Nancy A. Brown, Univ. Libn.
and Director of Libraries
(306) 343-4216

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at 10th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
Robert Maloy, Director
(202) 357-2240

University of South Carolina Libraries
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Libs.
(803) 777-3142

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(213) 743-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Kenneth G. Peterson, Dean of
Library Affairs
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2016

State University of New York at Albany
Libraries
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
Joseph Z. Nitecki, Director
(518) 457-8540

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Saktidas Roy, Director
(716) 636-2965

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Library
Stony Brook, New York 11794
John B. Smith, Director & Dean of Lib.
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald C. Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Paley Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Joseph A. Boisse, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Donald R. Hunt, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Harold W. Billings, Director
(512) 471-3811

Texas A&M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(713) 845-8111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 1A5
Robert Blackburn, Director
(416) 978-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
William Newman, Director
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger K. Hanson, Director
(801) 581-8558

Vanderbilt University Library
419 21st Avenue South
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

Virginia Polytechnic Institue & State University Libraries
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
H. Gordon Bechanan, Director of Libs.
(703) 961-5593

University of Virginia
Alderman Library
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026 or 7849

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
Allene F. Schnaitter, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(314) 889-5400

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Western Ontario Libraries
London 72, Canada
Robert Lee, Director of Libs.
(519) 679-3165

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

York University Library
4700 Keele Street
Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3J 2R2
Anne Woodsworth, Director
(416) 667-2235

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

REPORT ON FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(Modified Cash Basis)

(with supplementary information)

YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1980 AND 1979

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Years ended December 31, 1980 and 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Auditors' Report	1
Financial Statements (Modified Cash Basis)	
Statements of Assets and Liabilities	2
Statements of Revenue and Expenses and Changes in Fund Balance	
General Operating Fund	3
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Agency Fund	4
Chinese Center Revolving Fund	5
Notes to Financial Statements	6-7
Supplementary Information	8
General Operating Fund - Schedules of Expenses	9
Special Programs - Schedule of Revenue and Expenses and Changes in Program Balances	10
Other Programs - Schedule of Revenue and Expenses and Changes in Program Balances	11
Analysis of Cash	12

GARNER, BLOOM & CO., CHARTERED
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

8630 FENTON STREET, SUITE 708
SILVER SPRING, MARYLAND 20910
301 585-5300

Board of Directors
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, DC

We have examined the statements of assets and liabilities of the Association of Research Libraries as of December 31, 1980, and the related statements of revenue and expenses and changes in fund balances for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and, accordingly, included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We did not examine the financial statements of the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project which reflect total assets and revenues constituting 6% and 13% respectively for 1980 and 7% and 14% for 1979 of the related totals. These statements were examined by other auditors whose reports thereon have been furnished to us. Our opinion expressed herein, insofar as it relates to the amounts included for such project, is based solely upon the reports of the other auditors. The financial statements of the Association of Research Libraries for the year ended December 31, 1979, were examined by other auditors whose report dated January 24, 1980, expressed an unqualified opinion on those modified cash basis statements.

As described in Note 1, the Association's policy is to prepare its financial statements on a modified basis of cash receipts and disbursements; consequently certain revenue and the related assets are recognized when received rather than when earned, and certain expenses are recognized when paid rather than when the obligation is incurred. Accordingly, the accompanying financial statements are not intended to present financial position and results of operations in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

In our opinion, based upon our examination and the reports of the other auditors, the financial statements mentioned present fairly the assets and liabilities of the Association of Research Libraries at December 31, 1980, and the revenue collected and expenses paid and changes in fund balances for the year then ended, on the basis of accounting described in Note 1, applied on a consistent basis.

Garner, Bloom & Co. Chartered

January 22, 1981

131

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

STATEMENTS OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

ASSETS

	December 31, 1980	December 31, 1979
Cash in bank and on hand	$ 45,978	$ 31,804
Cash in savings accounts	24,875	1,872
Cash held by others - agency fund	46,438	57,361
Savings certificates	633,548	705,474
Deposits	894	1,094
Furniture and equipment, at cost less accumulated depreciation (Note 5)	21,613	24,887
Total assets	$ 773,346	$ 822,492

LIABILITIES

Payroll taxes withheld	$ 3,457	$ 3,263
Funds collected and payable to others	-0-	3,500
Special programs for which the Association is accountable to the grantors	192,543	202,973
Total liabilities	196,000	209,736

FUND BALANCES

General Operating Fund	93,099	99,763
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Agency Fund	46,438	57,361
Chinese Center Revolving Fund	437,809	455,632
Total fund balances	577,346	612,756
Total liabilities and fund balances	$ 773,346	$ 822,492

See accompanying notes to financial statements

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

GENERAL OPERATING FUND
STATEMENTS OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES AND
CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

	Year ended December 31,	
	1980	1979
Revenue		
Dues	$ 275,375	$ 277,125
Interest	19,357	16,856
Publications	3,759	8,263
Royalties	46	197
	298,537	302,441
Expenses	326,690	333,069
Less administrative expenses charged to special programs	21,489	21,108
Net expenses	305,201	311,961
Excess of expenses over revenue	(6,664)	(9,520)
Fund balance, beginning of year	99,763	109,283
Fund balance, end of year	$ 93,099	$ 99,763

See accompanying notes to financial statements

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILM PROJECT AGENCY FUND
STATEMENTS OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES AND
CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

	Year ended December 31,	
	1980	1979
Revenue		
Dues	$ 90,740	$ 92,360
Sales to members and non-members	80,191	77,157
Interest	2,223	1,413
	173,154	170,930
Expenses		
Newspapers and microfilm	75,394	72,641
Purchases for members and non-members	54,341	67,846
Salaries	40,005	35,192
Payroll taxes	2,452	2,115
Insurance	1,276	1,986
Storage	1,760	1,760
Supplies	1,438	1,714
Royalties	3,252	381
Miscellaneous	4,159	3,955
	184,077	187,590
Excess of expenses over revenue	(10,923)	(16,660)
Fund balance, beginning of year	57,361	74,021
Fund balance, end of year	$ 46,438	$ 57,361

See accompanying notes to financial statements

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CHINESE CENTER REVOLVING FUND
STATEMENTS OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES AND
CHANGES IN FUND BALANCE

	Year ended December 31,	
	1980	1979
Revenue		
Sales of publications	$ 104,484	$ 110,384
Interest income	48,481	42,853
	152,965	153,237
Expenses		
Transfers to Center for Chinese Research Materials Program	117,401	86,890
Cost of publications	50,482	58,903
Postage and other expenses	2,905	6,468
	170,788	152,261
Excess of (expenses over revenue) revenue over expenses	(17,823)	976
Fund balance, beginning of year	455,632	454,656
Fund balance, end of year	$ 437,809	$ 455,632

See accompanying notes to financial statements

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

---

1. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of accounting

The accounts of the Association are maintained on a modified cash basis of accounting. Under this method, effect is given only to cash collections and payments except that furniture and equipment is capitalized and depreciated over its estimated useful life. Accordingly, the financial statements do not show accrued income, costs and expenses, and the receivables and payables that would result from such accruals.

Fund accounting

To ensure observance of limitations and restrictions placed on the use of resources available to the Association, the accounts of the Association are maintained in accordance with the principles of fund accounting. This is the procedure by which resources for various purposes are classified for accounting and reporting purposes into funds established according to their nature and purposes. Separate accounts are maintained for each fund; accordingly, all financial transactions have been recorded and reported by fund group.

Grants are accounted for separately and classified in the liabilities section of the accompanying statements of assets and liabilities as "funds accountable to others".

Furniture, equipment and depreciation

Furniture and equipment is stated at cost. Expenditures for additions, renewals and betterments are capitalized. Upon retirement or disposal of assets, the cost and accumulated depreciation or amortization are eliminated from the accounts and the resulting gain or loss is included in income. Depreciation is computed on the straight-line method over an estimated useful life of ten years.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (CONTINUED)

2. INCOME TAXES

The Association is exempt from federal income tax under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

3. LEASE

The Association rents its office facilities under an operating lease that expires on June 30, 1981. Minimum lease payments due in 1981 are $20,111.

Total rent and storage charges were $42,183 for 1980 and $38,269 for 1979.

4. RETIREMENT PLANS

The Association has a retirement plan that covers substantially all full-time employees. Contributions to the plan are based on a percentage of salary for enrolled staff members. Total amounts paid in by the Association were $49,040 and $52,864 for 1980 and 1979 respectively.

5. FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT

Furniture and equipment are categorized as follows:

	1980	1979
Center for Chinese Research Material	$ 11,887	$ 11,887
Academic Library Program	15,641	15,641
Association of Research Libraries	31,077	30,687
	58,605	58,215
Less: Accumulated depreciation	36,992	33,328
Net property and equipment	$ 21,613	$ 24,887

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Our examination was made for the purpose of forming an opinion on the basic financial statements taken as a whole. The supplementary information included on pages 9 through 12 is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the basic financial statements. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the examination of the basic financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

Hamm, Bloom & Co. Chartered
Certified Public Accountants

Silver Spring, Maryland
January 22, 1981

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

GENERAL OPERATING FUND
SCHEDULES OF EXPENSES

	Year ended December 31, 1980	1979
Board and committee expenses	$ 17,818	$ 8,782
Computer services	1,273	1,225
Conference expense	19,086	17,806
Dues	5,588	1,948
Depreciation	1,947	2,496
Honorarium	300	600
Hospitalization	2,992	2,481
Insurance and bonding	2,409	5,016
Miscellaneous	1,583	2,318
Payroll taxes	8,116	8,476
Periodicals and subscriptions	2,143	2,242
Printing	13,363	12,524
Professional fees	6,045	7,184
Postage and freight	4,970	3,563
Rent	11,285	11,211
Retirement plan	11,287	17,181
Salaries	142,629	146,510
Staff travel and expenses	8,113	16,042
Stationery and office expenses	7,879	7,784
Telephone	5,364	5,180
Funding for special programs - University Library Management Study Office and ALP	52,500	52,500
	$ 326,690	$ 333,069

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

SPECIAL PROGRAMS
SCHEDULE OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES AND CHANGES IN PROGRAM BALANCES

	Center For Chinese Research Materials	Academic Library Program	Lilly Project
Revenue			
Grants	$ 100,000	$ 60,000	$ 100,000
Sale of publications	-0-	63,873	-0-
ARL support - transferred from General Operating Fund	-0-	52,500	-0-
Support from Chinese Center Revolving Fund	117,401	-0-	-0-
Workshops and training programs	-0-	1,742	-0-
Management Institutes	-0-	65,729	-0-
Interest income	-0-	17,047	-0-
Miscellaneous	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total revenue	217,401	260,891	100,000
Expenses			
Allocated administrative fees	21,489	-0-	-0-
Consulting fees, computer expenses and sub-contracts	3,503	10,953	64,200
Depreciation	543	1,175	-0-
Employee benefits	22,662	13,107	6,380
Miscellaneous	-0-	874	-0-
Office expenses	6,038	14,366	550
Payroll taxes	8,242	10,077	15
Periodicals and subscriptions	704	1,010	-0-
Postage	999	6,351	800
Printing	2,847	26,261	2,391
Professional services	-0-	-0-	-0-
Rent and storage	13,348	15,350	2,200
Salaries	133,531	111,669	26,842
Telephone	1,120	6,624	1,200
Training (net)	-0-	1,274	-0-
Travel	2,375	39,491	14,477
Total expenses	217,401	258,582	119,055
Excess of (expenses over revenue) revenue over expenses	-0-	2,309	(19,055)
Program balance, beginning of of year	-0-	182,448	14,768
Program balance, end of year	$ -0-	$ 184,757	$ (4,287)

Preservation	Bibliographic Control Project	SPEC Wilson (New)	Other Projects	Year ended December 31, 1980 Total	1979 Total
$ 53,172	$ 38,000	$ 14,750	$ -0-	$ 365,922	$ 311,333
-0-	-0-	-0-	212	64,085	61,979
-0-	779	-0-	-0-	53,279	52,500
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	117,401	86,890
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1,742	7,027
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	65,729	28,425
-0-	-0-	-0-	105	17,152	18,853
-0-	-0-	-0-	150	150	548
53,172	38,779	14,750	467	685,460	567,555
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	21,489	16,639
696	35,568	-0-	-0-	114,920	45,489
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1,718	1,908
7,028	-0-	-0-	-0-	49,177	47,169
634	755	64	1,250	3,577	82
1,319	300	720	-0-	23,293	23,115
-0-	-0-	-0-	7	18,341	17,216
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1,714	2,700
254	-0-	312	-0-	8,716	12,194
75	-0-	3,414	275	35,263	42,587
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1,712
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	30,898	27,058
30,348	3,800	8,468	61	314,719	294,385
675	-0-	-0-	-0-	9,619	7,525
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	1,274	8,068
4,829	-0-	-0-	-0-	61,172	83,186
45,858	40,423	12,978	1,593	695,890	631,033
7,314	(1,644)	1,772	(1,126)	(10,430)	(63,478)
-0-	1,644	-0-	4,113	202,973	266,451
$ 7,314	$ -0-	$ 1,772	$ 2,987	$ 192,543	$ 202,973

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

OTHER PROGRAMS
SCHEDULE OF REVENUE AND EXPENSES AND CHANGES IN PROGRAM BALANCES

Year ended December 31, 1980

	SPEC Wilson (old)	Brasonese Conference
Revenue		
Sale of publications	$ -0-	$ -0-
Interest income	-0-	105
Miscellaneous	-0-	-0-
Total revenue	-0-	105
Expenses		
Miscellaneous	39	109
Payroll taxes	7	-0-
Printing	275	-0-
Salaries	61	-0-
Total expenses	382	109
Excess of (expenses over revenue) revenue over expenses	(382)	(4)
Program balance, beginning of year	382	1,870
Program balance, end of year	$ -0-	$ 1,866

Index Grant (Wilson)	United States Japan Friendship Commissions	University Library Management Study Office	Resource Notebook (Wilson)	Total Other Projects
$ -0-	$ 212	$ -0-	$ -0-	$ 212
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	105
-0-	-0-	-0-	150	150
-0-	212	-0-	150	467
8	12	1,062	20	1,250
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	7
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	275
-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	61
8	12	1,062	20	1,593
(8)	200	(1,062)	130	(1,126)
2,183	(1,254)	1,062	(130)	4,113
$ 2,175	$ (1,054)	$ -0-	$ -0-	$ 2,987

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

ANALYSIS OF CASH

	December 31, 1980	December 31, 1979
Uses of cash		
Excess of expenses over revenue (revenue over expenses)		
General Operating Fund	$ 6,664	$ 9,520
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Agency Fund	10,923	16,660
Chinese Center Revolving Fund	17,823	(976)
Special Programs	10,430	63,478
Total	45,840	88,682
Less depreciation (a non-cash expense)	3,665	4,404
Cash absorbed by operations	42,175	84,278
Funds collected prior and paid to others	3,500	-0-
Purchase of furniture and equipment	391	6,436
Total	46,066	90,714
Sources of cash		
Funds collected and payable to others	-0-	3,500
Increase in payroll taxes withheld	194	218
Decrease in deposits	200	65
Total	394	3,783
Decrease in cash	45,672	86,931
Cash balance, beginning of year	796,511	883,442
Cash balance, end of year	$ 750,839	$ 796,511